

mission, but other institutional devices which might offer prospects for more effective control of interstate problems.

Monumental as the task is of achieving improved air quality, we have the actual or potential technological and economic resources to do the job. We are, I believe, at the point of several significant and exciting technological breakthroughs, and I am confident that many others lie just beyond the horizon if we mobilize our resources for this purpose.

I have in mind, for example, pilot programs which are now going forward on the liquefaction of high-sulfur coal, in which a fuel oil is produced with no sulfur content, a coal char with seven-tenths of one percent sulfur content, and the sulfur is recaptured for commercial purposes. Though experts differ at the present time concerning the economic feasibility of the process, it seems likely that it is only a matter of time before such questions are resolved.

In the field of auto exhaust pollution, Secretary of HEW Gardner, recently promulgated standards for the control of evaporative hydro-carbons only a few weeks after a feasible device was demonstrated by a major oil research firm.

More recently, during our subcommittee's field hearings last week in Los Angeles, we were given a demonstration of what appears to be the first feasible device for the control of nitrous oxides. Such advances will, I believe, be forthcoming with increasing frequency as we gain momentum in the field of pollution abatement.

This is, of course, a field in which your society and professional engineering in general have a place of preeminent importance. The challenge of improving the quality of our urban-industrial environment is one of the truly important tasks of our time. It should enlist our best resources of intellect and imagination, for the quality of life on this planet is at least as important as determining what lies on the far side of the moon.

Scientists and engineers, more than any other professions, are responsible for the great strides in technological development that we have experienced in recent decades. It now rests primarily with your professions to help augment the state of the art to improve the quality of our environment—and thus the quality of life which will give meaning to the advancement of technology.

STATEMENT RELEASED SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1967, BY WEIRTON STEEL CO., DIVISION OF NATIONAL STEEL CORP., WEIRTON, W. VA., CONCERNING ITS AIR AND STREAM POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES SINCE 1951 AND ITS PROJECTIONS

Weirton Steel Division of the National Steel Corporation has spent approximately \$15 million on air and stream pollution control facilities since 1951, it was announced today

by C. G. Tournay, President. He added that "considerable additional expenditures will be made in order to effect total pollution control."

"Even prior to 1951," he said, "Weirton Steel Division had begun a systematic step-by-step program of pollution control, and since that time the program has advanced as rapidly as technological development of control equipment would permit."

The latest control facilities to be installed at Weirton are on the "Mill of the Future" which is scheduled for start-up later this year and will combine basic oxygen furnaces, vacuum degassing and continuous casting.

Effluent from the basic oxygen furnaces will be removed in a wet scrubber, resulting in a clean stack on the operation which will meet all existing control requirements. Over 50 million gallons of water per day will be required to operate this mill. Ninety percent of the water will be recirculated through a complex filtering and clarifying system. As a result, water returned to the Ohio River will meet the most stringent requirements for water quality.

Another important step in the Weirton Steel program was taken nearly two years ago when the huge electrostatic precipitator was placed in operation on the No. 13 and No. 14 open hearth furnaces. The unit removes effluent from discharges of the furnaces by means of electrically charged plates, cleaning 7,500 tons of air per day.

The precipitator was first activated on April 30, 1965 by U.S. Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia who, on the occasion, stated: "If all industrial management officials were as progressive and as civic minded as are those of the Weirton Steel, and if all state and local officials were as conscious of their responsibilities in the field of pollution control as are those now serving in West Virginia, the Congress would perhaps not need to act on Federal standards for air and water quality."

"As legislators," Senator Randolph continued, "we must recognize that these large expenditures for cleaning our air and water and for the beautification of America do not result in any financial return to industry. On the contrary, they result in substantial costs."

The combination of the precipitator in the open hearth and the wet scrubber on the basic oxygen furnaces in the "Mill of the Future" will eliminate by the end of this year in Weirton the plumes of brown smoke referred to in President Johnson's air pollution message on January 30.

Mr. Tournay commented that "installation of the massive, non-productive pollution control facilities has been done on a voluntary basis in cooperation with local and state governments."

He added that "air and stream pollution control is not limited just to the operations

that produce brown plumes of smoke, but touches virtually all operations in the steel-making process."

In the coke plant, he said, phenol discharges are controlled by the most advanced phenol recovery plant in the industry. The phenols, if permitted to enter the Ohio River, would be a potential cause of a medicinal taste in drinking water. Also in the coke plant, all 294 coke ovens have been equipped with knife-edge self-sealing doors to reduce black smoke.

At the blast furnace department, all four furnaces have been equipped with a complex system of dust control including dust catchers, gas washers, precipitators and Venturi scrubbers. Water from these installations is transferred to two large clarifiers where the solids are removed before the water is discharged to the Ohio River.

The company has installed rotoclones, cyclones and a chemically-treated wet water system in the sinter plant to reduce dust emissions.

At the Strip Steel Department, all continuous pickling lines have been equipped with wet scrubbers to completely eliminate acid mist. The waste acid produced by these lines is collected and hauled to lagoons where it is neutralized and contained. This installation alone has an operating cost of more than \$1,500 per day.

In the Strip Steel tandem mills, construction has been completed on a highly complex oil recovery and water purification system in which waste oil, after repeated use on the mills, is pumped to a new oil recovery plant where oil is reclaimed and reused in company operations.

Similar controls for acid mist elimination, oil recovery, and the recirculation and containment of chemical waste are also in operation in the Sheet Mill and Tin Mill departments.

In addition to these in-plant controls, facilities have also been provided for stream pollution control at the coal preparation plant. Here water is constantly recirculated and cleaned for reuse at the plant and no discharge of "black water" is permitted from the operation.

Mr. Tournay said these facilities are only a portion of the total equipment installed by Weirton Steel to control air and stream pollution.

"Pollution control," Mr. Tournay added, "is not a new problem at Weirton Steel. The company has realistically faced the problem for more than 20 years and has made steady progress with its step-by-step program."

"We are aware of the accelerated interest by the public in the problems of air and stream pollution control, and we are not only continuing but are accelerating our efforts to completely resolve a problem that is of concern to us all."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Juhan Suurkivi, St. Mark's Temple Lutheran Church, Clifton Heights, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast made us for fellowship that reaches around the earth, we thank Thee for every gift which becomes richer as we share it, and more secure as we guard it for one another.

Unite us in the cause of righteousness, love, and peace. Set us firmly against tyranny, oppression, and dis-

crimination at home and abroad. Let us never grow indifferent to the agonizing cries of enslaved people in Estonia and in all nations under Communist rule.

Look with mercy upon those who must serve in places of great danger. Strengthen the President and all who are burdened by the responsibility of finding the way to a true and lasting peace, which shall bring glory to Thy name and blessings to people everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4573) entitled "An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, appointed Mr. INOUE to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 207, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. RIBICOFF to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, appointed Mr. HRUSKA to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy in lieu of Mr. CASE, resigned.

ROY A. ROBERTS OF THE KANSAS CITY STAR

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, at about this hour in Kansas City, memorial services are being conducted for the late Roy A. Roberts, of the Kansas City Star. His passing will be mourned by countless thousands. He will be remembered as the head of a paper that has been the recipient of five Pulitzer prizes and acclaimed repeatedly over the years by honorable mention as one of the 10 great newspapers of America.

My dear friend, the late Judge Eugene I. "Buck" Purcell of the Jackson County, Missouri, court best described Mr. Roberts as the kind of a man if he had to write something critical about a person would let him know far enough in advance to prepare his side of the issue and not be taken by surprise.

As a delegate to the 1956 convention, it was my privilege to visit with him in Chicago which he attended as a correspondent for his paper. He told me he had to be careful what he said about any of the candidates for President while the convention was going on because of its possible influence on our State's delegates. He added he thought a reporter should print the facts and he should not commingle news and editorial opinion in the same column. To me, this proved his unbiased above-board determination to give fair treatment to those he wrote about.

As a reporter he was seldom equaled. Heads of state, Government leaders, and captains of industry would confide in him because they knew he would honor their confidence. He could convey the meaning of complex situations in a language anyone could understand. He said he hoped he could make his columns sound as if he was talking to his readers, rather than writing for them. He made many predictions and most of them came true with uncanny accuracy.

It was his belief that it was important to dig out the facts because he believed only an informed people could make de-

mocracy work. He required all of his people at the Star to follow a policy of fairness. Roy Roberts was not only a good newspaperman but a great human being. He took a strong and fearless stand on every important issue, national and local, but then as a warm humanitarian would turn to the role of benefactor and befriender of those whom he felt needed his help. He will long be remembered for his contributions to American journalism.

SALMON IS AN ANADROMOUS FISH—NOT A DISEASE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an increase in the disease sometimes called Salmonella causes some concern to the fishing industry lest some people think the term refers to fish. Unfortunately, it is not widely known that the genus of bacteria causing this disease was first identified by a scientist whose name was Salmon. As a consequence, the disease carries his name.

Obviously, there is inherent danger of public confusion and that some people will get the idea that the source of the disease is related to the nutritious and wholesome anadromous fish called salmon. Any such impression of course has an adverse effect on many fishermen and the salmon industry.

To invite the coining any common use of some other scientific term, and to clear up confusion, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that terms "Salmonella" and "salmonellosis" should not be used in reference to any genus of bacteria or bacterially caused disease. I am hopeful there will be ever widening recognition that not only are salmon a delicious delicacy, but likewise being rich in protein, are unsurpassed as an energy food and should be on every household diet regularly for pleasure in good eating and likewise for health and good living. Passage by Congress of my resolution, I am hopeful, will encourage medical journals and doctors to use some other term that will not do violence to one of the great living resources of the sea.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI DEFENDS AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure that some cadets from the Air Force Academy have left school due to violation of the honor code has pro-

duced expected Monday-morning quarterbacking of the Academy by some Members of Congress. This instinctive urge to question the honor code at the Academy parallels in a very interesting fashion the current hue and cry against the CIA.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Air Force, Naval, and Military Academies are all being excellently administered and are meeting their responsibilities in a very effective fashion. They are producing young men of extremely high caliber who are filling their expected role as the backbone of our career military officer category.

All three Academies are emphasizing not only very practical educational programs, but have set and are maintaining extremely high standards of proficiency as well as the code of honor among the students.

Whenever there is a disclosure of this nature there are immediate cries against the necessary discipline and the unique esprit de corps of the Academies.

We must keep in mind that these are not universities. They are not a haven for beatniks, superintellectuals, or socialites, but are special educational-military schools devoted to turning out career military officers who are the finest in the world.

One of the great virtues of our Military Establishment is that its career officials have been continually drawn from civilian backgrounds and provided with the excellent training which has been demonstrated in superior leadership in time of war and sound preparedness in peacetime.

We should properly emphasize the overall soundness of our military academies and their great records of accomplishment, rather than to blindly criticize their administration or attempt to interfere with the necessary discipline and code of honor.

PAUL G. ROGERS, OF FLORIDA, PRAISES COMMISSIONING OF ATLANTIC UNDERSEA TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in bringing to the attention of the House the commissioning of the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center in West Palm Beach, Fla.

I would make note of the importance given this occasion by the presence of the Vice President and the major address he delivered at the dedication ceremonies. I will place this outstanding speech in the Record within the next day or two.

The Vice President's leadership and active interest in the field of oceanography has led the enthusiasm which government and private industry are exhibiting in this new and exciting field.

The development of the Nation's un-

dersea defense system gives this country added muscle, and the people of the Nation will realize added benefits from the exploration, research, and development of the seas.

Through the efforts made by the Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center, the Nation will be able to make more effective use of the seas.

Mr. Speaker, we see here just one more step in our program to fully utilize the vast resources that lie beneath the oceans.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967.

This plan would transfer from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation authority to approve the surrender of certain ship documents. These documents include certificates of ownership, declarations of citizenship, and related ship papers issued for commercial vessels covered by preferred mortgages or owned by the United States.

Under the act establishing the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, will have responsibility for recording bills of sale, transfers, and mortgages of ships; for issuing new marine documents; and for retaining custody of preferred mortgages on vessels.

The Secretary of Transportation will not, however, have the authority to approve the surrender of documents for vessels covered by preferred mortgages. That authority still resides with the Secretary of Commerce.

As a result, shipowners will have to deal with two separate departments of the Federal Government every time a ship's name is changed, its structure is modified, or it is sold or transferred.

In each of these and other cases, the shipowner must first seek the approval of the Secretary of Commerce to surrender the ship's documents and then request the Secretary of Transportation to issue new documents.

The reorganization plan is designed to eliminate this duplication of effort, and to save time and expense for shipowners.

This is not a major reorganization plan. But it is important. It is part of our larger effort to streamline the Government, to make its operations as efficient as possible, and to enable it to provide better service to the citizens and businessmen of this country.

This plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title V of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of

the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of that title.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1967.

THE NATION'S CAPITAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 61)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our goal for the Nation's Capital is a city of which all Americans can be proud.

As I said 2 years ago, this city and its government must be, for its residents and the entire world, "A living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government." It should be a city of beauty and inspiration, of equal justice and opportunity. It should be a model for every American city, large and small. It should be a city in which our citizens and our friends from abroad can live and work, visit our great national monuments, and enjoy our parks and walk our streets without fear.

The District of Columbia is the Nation's ninth largest city. It is the center of the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country, with a population today of 2.5 million. As such, its citizens have all the problems—and are entitled to all the rights—of the citizens of any large city in this country.

The District of Columbia is also the Capital of our Nation, and the seat of every major agency of the Federal Government. As such, there is a significant Federal interest in the affairs of this city.

Since I have been President, I have addressed myself to the difficult problem of balancing the interest of the residents of the District as citizens of a large city with that of the National Government as representative of the people of the entire country.

The actions of the 89th Congress demonstrate that it shares my concern that both these interests be fairly served. While the 89th Congress did not move forward in every field as many of us would have preferred, its accomplishments do illustrate our mutual interest in making the District of Columbia a place in which we can all take pride:

A new 4-year college and a technical institute were authorized to bring better education and training to our young.

A mass transit system was authorized to serve the city and its suburbs and an interstate agency was created to plan and build the system.

A comprehensive minimum wage law was enacted.

Urban renewal was started for the commercial area in the heart of the city.

Two new museums, the Hirshhorn and the Air and Space, were authorized.

A commission to plan a visitors' center was established.

These actions are an important, and a very historic, beginning.

The District's programs for housing, education, health, welfare, and recreation must be expanded and improved. Its war against crime must be sharply stepped up.

The 1968 budget for the District calls for increased efforts in each of these areas. The budget would finance long-delayed school construction projects. It would provide the personnel and equipment needed to enhance the quality of education. It would provide resources vitally needed by the police and it would enable us to combat crime at its source with improved housing, education, training, health, and rehabilitation services.

But prompt action on the 1968 budget alone is not enough.

The citizens of the District are entitled to:

Elect the government which serves them.

Efficient and effective government machinery.

Representation in the Congress of the United States.

Streets and homes that are free from crime and the fear of crime.

The citizens of our Nation as well as those of the District, are entitled to a Capital that is:

Inspiring, dignified, and beautiful.

A place where the great scholars of the Nation and the world can come to work, study, and learn.

A hospitable location for the scores of foreign governments which are represented here.

Accessible by transportation convenient to all who visit here.

I. A BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia, as a major American city and the center of a large metropolitan area, faces all the problems of explosive urbanization—a rising crime rate, traffic congestion and parking shortages, decaying buildings and homes, and inadequate health and education services. To meet these needs, the District must have the most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing.

I recommend a three-point program to bring new vitality and strength to the District's government: Home rule; reorganization and strengthening of the District government; representation in the Congress.

HOME RULE

To provide a system of government appropriate for the people who live here and worthy of our heritage, the residents of the District of Columbia must be given a voice in the selection of their local officials.

The citizens of the District today have no voice in the government of their city. Despite the principle so long cherished in this country, they are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship and at the same time denied one of its most fundamental rights.

This continuing denial of democracy is an affront to our traditions and to the citizens who make the District their home.

The need for home rule stems from practical considerations as well. Man-

agement of any large metropolitan center, in this era of rapid technological and social change, must be promptly responsive to new demands and new conditions. The Congress, preoccupied as it should be with the problems of this great Nation, cannot be expected to provide the day-to-day management that should be provided by locally elected officials. The 535 Members of Congress should not be expected to serve as city councilmen for the city of Washington.

The bill to provide self-government for the District, which I transmitted to the 89th Congress, was designed to afford local citizens a full voice in their affairs and at the same time provide adequate safeguards for the legitimate interest of the Federal Government in our Nation's Capital. The Senate passed that bill. While the House of Representatives did not pass the bill I submitted, a majority of its Members clearly went on record in support of the principle of home rule.

I again endorse the home rule bill.

As I said in my message on the District of Columbia budget:

I believe that the last Congress should have granted home rule to the citizens of the District, and I urge the present Congress to give them home rule.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Improvements in District government need not await the passage of home rule legislation. Interim action under the Reorganization Act can bring urgently needed improvements to make the present unwieldy structure into an efficient and effective instrument of municipal government.

I will shortly transmit to the Congress a reorganization proposal to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia.

The present District government organization was established almost a century ago. The District was then a community of 150,000 people. Less than 500 persons were employed by its government.

Today the District has 800,000 residents. Its government employs some 30,000 people. Its 1968 budget is more than half a billion dollars. This major metropolis cannot be properly governed with the cumbersome machinery of an archaic and obsolete structure.

The District is entitled to have the best and most efficient municipal government we can provide. The Nation's Capital should lead the country in applying the techniques of modern management to the organization and administration of its programs.

The reorganization plan I propose would create a mayor-council form of government—the form which has been found most successful in the Nation's 27 largest cities.

Under the reorganization plan, the President, subject to Senate confirmation, would appoint from among District residents a single Commissioner as chief executive and a Council of nine members.

The single Commissioner would serve at the pleasure of the President. Council members would serve 2-year terms, five to be appointed one year and four the next. The staggered terms would

insure continuity of experience on the Council.

The powers and responsibilities which the three-man Board of Commissioners presently have would be apportioned between the single Commissioner and the Council. The Commissioner would be assigned the executive functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners. Like most mayors, he would be given responsibility and authority to organize and manage the District government, to administer its programs, and to prepare its budget of revenues and expenses.

The Council would be responsible primarily for making local rules and regulations—the District's city ordinances. This would include the quasi-legislative functions which are now performed by the Board of Commissioners, such as licensing rules, the issuance of police regulations, and the establishment of rates for property taxation. It would also review and approve the Commissioner's budget for submission to the President.

This reorganization would unify executive and administrative authority in a single Commissioner. While the District has been fortunate in the caliber and dedication of men who have become Commissioners, divided executive authority cannot provide effective management for the municipal affairs of a city of almost 1 million people.

The Capital City of this Nation can no longer afford Government by three heads—each wearing several hats. To achieve their maximum potential, District programs—and federally assisted programs in the District—require clear-cut executive authority and flexible government machinery at the local level—not divided authority which too often produces prolonged negotiations and inaction. A single executive can bring effective management, direction, and control to the task of meeting increasingly complex needs.

But reorganization alone will not assure the Nation's Capital the best municipal government. The District must also be able to attract and hold topmen in the widely varying fields required for effective city government.

I recommend legislation to give the District government an ample quota of its own top executive level positions—supergrades and levels IV and V. The District government must be able to offer attractive salaries and opportunities for career advancement if it is to draw the caliber of person which the government of the Nation's Capital deserves.

As these fundamental changes are made, it will be possible to effect further improvements, both in the structure of the District government and in its relationships to other agencies serving the Nation's Capital.

These proposals in no way substitute for home rule. The single Commissioner and the nine-man Council will give the District a better organized and more efficient government, but they will have no functions beyond those the three Commissioners now possess. The new structure will make the transition to self-government easier, but only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government—of, by, and for its citizens.

REPRESENTATION IN THE CONGRESS

A proper complement to locally elected District officials is locally elected voting representation in the Congress.

I recommend that the Constitution be amended to authorize one Representative for the District of Columbia in the House and such additional representation in the House and the Senate as the Congress may from time to time provide.

Upon ratification, this would give the District of Columbia at least one sure voice—the minimum possible voting representation—in the Congress. At the same time, it would provide, through the Congress, the ability to adjust the representation for the District as population increases and as other changes make such adjustments appropriate and fair.

Ratification by the States and enactment of the necessary implementing legislation will take some time. But District citizens should not be left completely without a voice in the Congress during this vital interim period. They are entitled to some representation in the Congress now.

I recommend legislation to permit the citizens of the District to elect a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives. Such a delegate would be comparable to the delegates who formerly represented Hawaii and Alaska and to the present Resident Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A delegate from the District in the House of Representatives would be of benefit to both the Congress and the District in providing a more adequate line of communication on District matters. A collateral benefit would be the opportunity for District citizens, through the experience of biennial elections, to develop additional local leadership and more effective political organizations responsive to the citizens who live here.

II. THE WAR ON CRIME

In my message to the Congress on Crime in America, I said:

Lawlessness is like a plague. Its costs, whether economic, physical or psychological, are spread through every alley and every street in every neighborhood. It creates a climate in which people make choices, not out of confidence, but out of fear.

That plague has struck our Nation's Capital. But, as I said in that same message:

We can control crime if we will. We must act boldly, now, to treat ancient evils and to insure the public safety.

In my 1965 message on the District of Columbia, I announced the establishment of the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia and asked for additional policemen, special incentives to attract and hold first-rate policemen, improvements in our courts to handle the growing criminal caseload, new correctional techniques to break the cycle of crime, prison, release, and crime.

The Congress responded and in the past 2 years there have been significant advances. Working together, we have increased police salaries, authorized overtime compensation for police officers, provided additional judgeships in the court of general sessions, established a work-release program for misdemeanor

offenders, and created the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

Through the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the Department of Justice has provided funds to support development of a model police radio communications system, a police planning bureau, an in-service police training program for all staff levels, a computerized law enforcement information system for the metropolitan area, additional mobile units.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have issued orders reorganizing the Police Department and the Department of Corrections to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

These are significant steps forward. But more—much more—remains to be done.

In December 1966, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia submitted a comprehensive report on the nature and extent of the District's crime problem and on the quality of the District's response to it. The report assembled facts, carefully explored alternatives, and presented a broad and practical program for action.

The Crime Commission reported that since 1960:

The rate of homicides and housebreakings in the District has doubled.

The rate of robberies and auto thefts has almost tripled.

The rate of grand larcenies has increased by more than 50 percent.

The Commission's report emphasizes that any meaningful attack on crime involves comprehensive and persistent action over a period of several years. The report makes the priorities clear. We must:

Develop new programs to deal with juvenile delinquency.

Develop and use the most effective law enforcement machinery available.

Strengthen our courts and prosecutors so that persons charged with crime can be tried quickly and fairly.

Guarantee that our rehabilitative efforts reflect the wisest experience in the field of corrections, so that we can break the vicious cycle of crime, prison, and more crime.

Develop an information and evaluation system which permits rapid appraisal of our efforts to control crime.

Measured against the demands of these goals, piecemeal efforts will not suffice. Crime will not be controlled by strengthening just one or two agencies in the field. All parts of the government with law enforcement and criminal justice responsibilities must be strengthened. Private citizens must participate at every level—from support for the police and promptly reporting crimes, to testifying in court and employing good risk offenders.

THE COMMITMENT

Crime in the sixties and seventies can no more be fought with inadequate budgets and obsolete tools than with words of public indignation. The District of Columbia needs financial resources to provide the manpower, training, new facilities, and equipment and information systems—to prevent crime before it occurs, to process offenders swiftly, and to develop programs which

prevent repetition of crime by offenders and return them to useful lives.

Equally important, the police and government officials of the District need the personal support of every citizen who lives here and of the Congress. So long as I am President, I will take every step necessary to control crime in the District and to make it a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime.

My message on the District's budget described some of the efforts we must make:

A further increase in police salaries. Additional funds to improve police planning, communications, and transportation.

More police officers, particularly sergeants to improve supervision.

Additional funds for our efforts to curb juvenile delinquency.

Expanded assistance for the planning, construction, and modernization of our courts and correctional facilities.

To support these efforts, I am requesting \$11.6 million—a 20-percent increase—in the fiscal 1968 appropriations for the District police, courts, and correctional activities. I urge the Congress to act promptly on this vital request.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Action on the District's budget alone is not enough. Our laws—and the weapons of those who enforce our laws—must be strengthened. I propose a 10-point program to achieve this objective.

1. GUN CONTROL

Pistols are relatively easy to purchase in the District of Columbia. As the Crime Commission found, "almost anyone who is willing to fill out a form and wait for 48 hours can buy a handgun." The only persons who may not purchase handguns are minors, the mentally ill, drug addicts, and convicted felons. It makes no difference whether the individual has any need to purchase a pistol. Pistols may also be purchased by mail without restriction.

Any person who is not a felon or drug addict may possess a pistol in the District. It makes no difference whether he is mentally ill, a minor, or a chronic alcoholic, whether the weapon was obtained legally or illegally or whether there is any need for possession of the weapon.

Between July 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966, 1,850 major crimes were committed in the District of Columbia with pistols; 73 homicides, 640 assaults, 1,137 robberies and attempted robberies.

No civilized community in the 20th century should permit a situation such as this to exist. Experience in cities that regulate the purchase and possession of handguns and the studies of the Crime Commission clearly show that strict controls can strengthen our efforts to reduce violent crimes. Such controls cannot eliminate the danger of violence in our society. But they can help keep lethal weapons out of dangerous and irresponsible hands.

As the District Crime Commission emphasized, New York City, with the most stringent pistol control law in the country, has many crimes committed with

handguns, but the relative number of such crimes is significantly less than in the District.

The District had a handgun murder rate of 9.1 per 100,000 of population in fiscal 1966, New York City had a rate of only 1.7. The handgun assault rate was 79.8 in the District, but only 20.0 in New York. The handgun robbery rate was 141.7 in the District, but only 45.4 in New York.

I recommend legislation to:

Prohibit possession of firearms by minors, chronic alcoholics, and the mentally ill, as well as felons and drug addicts who are covered by existing law.

Prohibit purchase of firearms by chronic alcoholics, as well as minors, the mentally ill, felons, and drug addicts who are now covered.

Require that any person desiring to purchase, possess, or carry a pistol in public obtain a license which will be granted only if he can show that he needs the weapon to protect his person or property.

Prohibit anyone from carrying rifles and shotguns in public, unless unloaded and properly encased.

Authorize the courts to impose increased penalties where a firearm is used in the commission of a robbery.

2. POWER TO ARREST WITHOUT A WARRANT

At present District police officers are authorized to arrest without a warrant only when they have reason to believe that the person has committed an armed robbery, murder, or some other felony, or one of a limited number of misdemeanors, such as possession of narcotics or carrying a concealed weapon. The police today may not arrest a person whom they believe has committed other serious offenses, such as an assault or unlawful entry, without first obtaining a warrant for his arrest.

I recommend legislation to extend the authority of police to arrest without a warrant to additional serious offenses, such as assault, unlawful entry, and attempted housebreaking. This will allow the police to respond more quickly and effectively to criminal acts threatening serious harm to our citizens.

3. WITNESSES

Of vital importance to crime control and any criminal prosecution is the availability of witnesses and their freedom from threats and intimidation.

Existing laws provide ample protections against intimidation of witnesses—but only after charges have been filed. It is not a crime to bribe or threaten persons with vital information before charges have been filed.

I recommend that the obstruction of justice statute be extended to cover interference with criminal investigations before charges have been filed.

In addition, the power of police to take custody of material witnesses at the scene of a crime must be clarified.

I recommend that the police of the District of Columbia be given authority to take custody of a material witness whenever there is reason to believe that he will not be available to testify in court. After the witness has been taken into custody, he would be promptly brought

before a judicial officer who could either set conditions upon his release to insure reappearance or make arrangements for taking his deposition prior to release.

4. CITATIONS BEFORE AND AFTER ARREST FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES

District police today spend enormous amounts of time guarding and transporting persons arrested for minor offenses. Even where the offense is minor and identity of the offender clear, the police must in each case arrest the offender and take him to the stationhouse before he can be released with orders to reappear for trial or a hearing to determine whether a trial should be held. This must be done even if the offense involves nothing more than annoying a neighbor or refusing to move on when asked by some local official. This results in an inexcusable waste of police time and energy and often prevents the police from fulfilling more important duties.

New York, California, and several other States have resolved this problem by authorizing the police to issue citations to persons they consider reliable to require a subsequent appearance in court or at the police station.

I recommend legislation to give the police discretion to issue citations for certain minor offenses requiring subsequent appearance by the suspect.

Under this proposal, the Court of General Sessions would determine the types of offenses which would fall within this procedure. The proposal would enable the police to release reliable persons at the place of arrest or the stationhouse, thus conserving valuable police time for more important crime detection and protection duties.

5. BAIL SUPERVISION

Much can—and should—be done to improve our bail practices.

We are now making every effort to speed up the judicial process, to shorten the periods between arrest and trial and between conviction and appeal. This would limit the period during which the suspect is at large pending trial or appeal.

In addition, we must minimize the risk to society created by releasing persons before their trial.

I recommend legislation to permit the Department of Corrections to supervise persons released pending trial. This legislation would make possible more careful supervision of persons released on bail and would help the released person obtain needed counseling and assistance.

6. PROCEDURES UPON PLEA OF INSANITY

Existing procedures governing the defense of insanity contribute neither to judicial efficiency nor to protection of the rights of criminal defendants. A criminal defendant need not notify the prosecution or the court that he intends to raise the defense of insanity. He can wait until the prosecution has completed the presentation of its case and then submit this complex defense.

As a result the prosecutor must either make extensive and costly preparations which may not be necessary or enter the trial unprepared to deal with the issue. If the prosecution is not prepared and in-

sanity is raised, a delay in the trial is unavoidable. But even where the trial is delayed, the government may not have sufficient time to prepare its case properly.

I recommend that counsel for a defendant who proposes to plead insanity be required to give advance notice to the prosecution.

This would protect the public against needless expense, where insanity is not in issue. It would protect the courts, the prosecution, and the defendant against needless delay, where insanity is unexpectedly raised.

7. CIVIL COMMITMENT FOR NARCOTICS OFFENSES

Last year I proposed the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to permit civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts. As I said at that time:

Our continued insistence on treating drug addicts, once apprehended, as criminals is neither humane nor effective. It has neither curtailed nor prevented crime.

I now recommend legislation to broaden the act's applicability in the District of Columbia.

Full criminal sanctions must be retained against the pushers who peddle narcotics—those who corrupt our children and destroy the lives of the young on whom they prey. But we must begin to provide treatment for those who are addicted to drugs. We must attempt "to eliminate the hunger for drugs that leads so many into lives of crime and degradation."

8. ALCOHOLIC OFFENSES

In fiscal 1965 there were 44,000 arrests for intoxication in the District of Columbia. This represents 50 percent of all nontraffic arrests. A few of these arrests were accompanied by assaults or other serious offenses. Most, however, involved nothing more than intoxication—and often just the intoxication of a chronic alcoholic.

This represents a tremendous waste of resources—police, courts, and prisons. Alcoholism, as both the National and District Crime Commissions pointed out, is not a criminal problem. It is a health problem. Alcoholics should not be arrested. They should be treated.

I recommend that the laws of the District be clarified so that police and Health Department personnel can take intoxicated persons not to a jail, but to a medical facility where they can receive proper treatment. Intoxication would be a criminal offense only when accompanied by conduct which endangers other persons or property.

9. CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

The Criminal Code of the District needs complete modernization and revision. It was last codified three-quarters of a century ago. The District Crime Commission cites many examples of vague, confusing, archaic, and conflicting provisions of substance and procedure. The District should have a coherent and consistent framework for the arrest and punishment of offenders and the control of crime.

I recommend the establishment of a Commission on Reform of Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia to review, modernize, and clarify the District's

Criminal Code. The 11-man Commission would be composed of representatives from the House and Senate, from the courts of the District and from the public at large.

10. CRIMINAL STATISTICS

The District must have a reliable means of discovering the effectiveness of its efforts to control crime. The report of the Crime Commission points out substantial gaps in the criminal information system. Police, courts, and correctional and juvenile institutions maintain separate and uncoordinated records, often creating conflicts in statistics and leaving the community without a comprehensive view of its criminal process. More significant, the policymakers in the District and the senior police officials lack the information essential to evaluate new and lasting crime control programs.

I have asked the District Commissioners to create a Bureau of Criminal Statistics. The Bureau would supply crime control agencies in the District with accurate data essential to their planning and evaluation functions and would end duplication of effort in data collection.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The District must be given the total resources necessary to mount an effective attack on crime. Its laws—and law enforcement officers—must be strengthened. But we must also improve our techniques for crime prevention, for processing offenders and for rehabilitating the convicted.

We must make additional efforts to stop crime where it most frequently begins—with the young offender:

In the 16 years from 1950 to 1965, nearly one-third of the persons arrested in the District for serious crimes were under 18.

In 1965 arrests of youth offenders under 18 for serious crimes increased by 53 percent over 1960; adult arrests decreased 11 percent during this same period.

In 1965, children 15 years and younger accounted for 36 percent of all house-breaking arrests and 27 percent of all robbery and auto theft arrests.

In January 1967, there were more youth offenders referred to the juvenile court than in any prior month.

The Crime Commission's report stresses the need for improving our efforts to rehabilitate our young offenders and restore them to useful and productive lives. But as the Commission stated:

The most productive approach for both the potential offender and the community is to prevent delinquency before it begins.

It will be neither simple nor cheap to halt the growth of juvenile crime. But we must commit the necessary resources. I have recommended in the budget urgently needed funds to strengthen and improve a variety of District programs—education, recreation, health and welfare, and the juvenile court.

I have requested funds for a major summer program which will provide recreation, training, and employment for disadvantaged youth.

I have also asked for funds to expand

the roving leader program which has had such marked success in dealing with gangs and delinquency-prone youth. These funds will permit the expansion of programs removing the causes of delinquency as well as the improvement of the various rehabilitative services afforded the youth in trouble.

Consistency in these efforts, coordination of present youth programs, public and private, and development of new prevention techniques are essential. The Crime Commission proposed that a Youth Services Office be established to carry out these responsibilities.

I recommend legislation to establish a District Youth Services Office to plan and direct all the services needed to combat juvenile delinquency.

This Office, recommended by the District Crime Commission, would encourage maximum efforts by public and private agencies, as well as by private individuals. It would make available through one source all the specialized services—counseling, remedial education, vocational training, employment assistance, and health and recreational services—needed by the young, their parents, school personnel, and other persons working with the youth of the District. It would test new ways to prevent and control delinquency and to restore the troubled youth to a satisfying and productive life.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

We must make improvements in the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The report of the Crime Commission's study of the District courts is particularly disturbing. The Commission points out that offenders are released and not tried—not from any deliberate policy of leniency or softness, but rather from the pressure of sheer numbers and impossible caseloads.

In fiscal 1966, the number of felony prosecutions was substantially less than it was 15 years ago—in the face of a substantial increase in the amount of crime and the number of arrests.

In fiscal 1965, only 15 percent of the adult felony charges filed by the police resulted in felony prosecutions in the District court. An efficient police department is not enough. We must have a judicial system fully capable of dealing swiftly and fairly with persons arrested by the police.

The courts and the bar are already engaged in serious efforts to find solutions. The District court and the court of general sessions have made significant strides in improving their procedures for handling criminal cases.

The Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit is preparing recommendations on ways to handle the staggering—and increasing—caseload of the court of general sessions, and to improve the processing of criminal cases in all of our courts. One promising method being explored is a program for round-the-clock processing of arrested persons and night sessions of court.

The Judicial Council is also at work on another recommendation of the Crime Commission—the proposal for a family court which would assume the respon-

sibilities of the juvenile court, the domestic relations branch of the court of general sessions, and the Mental Health Commission.

The need to find solutions remains urgent. I pledge the continuing cooperation and assistance of the executive branch to these efforts. I have asked the District Commissioners and the Acting Attorney General to review promptly any recommendations for improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia made by the courts or the Judicial Council and to take appropriate action to implement them.

CORRECTIONS

We must make improvements in the rehabilitation of the convicted offender. The report of the Crime Commission makes clear that the problem which the District faces is not too much probation and parole.

The Crime Commission's report revealed that two-thirds of those convicted of felonies in the District have already served at least one prison term. In addition, the Commission found that more than one-half of the felony offenders were unemployed when they committed their most recent crime.

No matter how long the sentences, most prisoners will eventually be returned to the community. The quality of the help they receive in prison and after release in building new lives for themselves makes the critical difference.

The District's correctional system is in need of modern facilities, more specialized personnel to provide counseling and vocational training, "halfway" houses to provide support during the critical release period, and community support to provide employment for persons with criminal records.

The budget I have recommended to the Congress will permit the District to begin to overcome these deficiencies and to plan to meet the needs of the future. It will:

Permit planning of a modern detention, diagnostic, and treatment facility to replace the District Jail and the District Receiving Home.

Allow closer supervision and improved counseling, training, and employment services for prisoners before and after release.

Provide greater services for youth offenders and an expanded work-training program to assist in the transition from jail to meaningful employment.

I strongly urge prompt and favorable action on these recommendations.

I also recommend that the Federal Prison Industries be authorized to manage and operate the industrial program of the District's correctional institutions. This agency, which has an enviable record of success in Federal prisons, will provide valuable assistance to the District in improving prison vocational training and employment opportunities.

This is the immediate battle plan in a total campaign to assure law and order for the District. Some parts require legislation. Some require funds. Some require improvements in procedures that courts, agencies, and administrators can themselves put into effect. A failure on any front in this war weakens the efforts

on all the others. Every course must be pursued. We must not fail.

I pledge myself—and I urge the Congress—to take every step which is necessary to ultimate success in our drive against crime. We must pursue every avenue and use every weapon which holds promise of advancing this effort. We will need the total commitment and cooperation of every man and woman in the District, if we are to have a city where civic order and social justice prevail.

As I said in my message on crime in America, "Public order is the first business of government."

III. THE DISTRICT AS THE CAPITAL

The District, as the Nation's Capital, must be able to serve the national purpose for which it was founded. Its great avenues must be preserved as a tribute to the past and an inspiration for the future. It should afford unparalleled opportunities for the great scholars of the country and the world. It must make every effort to meet the needs of emissaries from abroad. It must continually explore new ways to improve its overloaded transportation facilities.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Avenue, the District's most important thoroughfare, is the symbolic link between the White House and the Capitol. Throughout our history it has been the scene of ceremonies celebrating our triumphs and our tragedies.

Yet it has been allowed to wear down and become unworthy of its role. A temporary Commission created by Executive order is now engaged in bringing to the avenue the dignity and grandeur which it should have.

I recommend that the Congress support these efforts by prompt approval of the bill establishing a statutory Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

WOODROW WILSON CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, created by the Congress in 1961, recently recommended the establishment of a Center for Scholars at Market Square as a living memorial to that great President.

The proposal of the Woodrow Wilson Commission has much to commend it. Because of its broad educational aspects, I am appointing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. I am asking him, in consultation with the Commission, to conduct a study to develop a detailed proposal for the Center. When that study is completed, I will make further recommendations to the Congress.

It is my hope that the Center will serve as a place for bringing together scholars and students from other countries to increase understanding among peoples of the world, as well as an important educational institution.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For the District to serve its purpose as the Nation's Capital, it must provide for the representatives of foreign governments and international organizations. Increasingly, the unavailability of space for the legitimate needs of foreign gov-

ernments is becoming a matter of concern.

Many new countries require but have been unable to secure adequate space for their chanceries. Many older countries which are seeking larger quarters are having similar difficulties. The problem has become an unnecessary irritant in our international relationships.

I recommend legislation which, consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens, would specify an area northwest of Washington Circle to be available for foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations. The bill would authorize the Federal Government to acquire land in this area for appropriate disposition, as the Secretary of State may determine, to foreign governments and international organizations.

TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Last year, important decisions by the Congress and by local government agencies cleared the way for the development of highway and mass transit systems required to handle the growing transportation needs of the National Capital region. Meanwhile, the National Capital Planning Commission is recommending that a major transportation center be developed in the vicinity of the Union Station, where railroads, mass transit, and highways will come together.

I am asking the Planning Commission to take the lead, in cooperation with other agencies, to conduct a detailed study of this recommendation and to determine how such a center might be designed and brought into being. This study will be closely coordinated with the planning for the Visitors Center which the Congress has already authorized.

CONCLUSION

It will not be easy to achieve our goal for the Nation's Capital—a city in which all Americans can take pride. The problems to which this message is primarily directed—better government and crime—will not be solved overnight. Dedicated and persistent efforts by private citizens, private organizations, private businesses, and by the District and Federal Governments will be required.

The task is difficult and success will take time. We must—and we will—succeed.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1967.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a great thinker wrote that there is nothing so irresistible in history as an idea whose time has come. Today we have heard an eloquent and persuasive message of the President on the future of the Nation's Capital. It seems to me that the idea of a new Washington has arrived and it is irresistible.

The President's comprehensive plan suggests that we might do many things for Washington. Some will take time. Others could go into effect immediately. Whatever the time sequence, his recommendations are logical, rational, and right, and we ought to act on them.

We should get on with the business of granting the District home rule. This is so basic to municipal government that one wonders why we have hesitated so long. But time has a way of being persuasive. There are few here today who doubt that a body of people 800,000 strong should not have the right to elect its own government and manage its own affairs. Let us, then, finish the good work we began in the 89th Congress and grant Washingtonians a government of their own choosing.

Next, we ought to permit the District to discard its present outmoded commission form of government for a strong executive-council type which gets things done and clearly delineates responsibility.

Let us also consider granting the District temporary representation now in Congress with the intention of permanent representation when constitutional ratification is assured.

But the job is only half done when new laws or administrative orders are approved. Washington cannot face the future as a workable and progressive city until it has the funds, the personnel, and the programs to move itself forward into the 20th century.

The schools, job opportunities, housing, and law enforcement agencies of the District need our increased assistance and support. We have too long turned our eyes away from the dilapidated and deteriorated housing, the overcrowded and inadequate schools, the lack of job and career opportunity for its residents.

We have the chance to make up for past neglect with present achievement. Let us approve the needed laws. Let us reform the District's government. Let us allocate the funds needed to make this not just the first city of the Nation but the best city of the Nation. I urge all members to support the President's proposals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the series of proposals the President has made in his message on the Nation's Capital are as persuasive as they are eloquent, as broad as they are specific. He has charged us to do what is, simply, our duty. For the Congress has a special responsibility toward the Nation's Capital and toward the people who live in it. And we must fulfill that responsibility by supporting the series of programs outlined to us today.

First, and foremost, we must complete our work on home rule for Washington, for this is a basic power without which a modern city cannot function effectively. We must give District citizens the right to elect and select those who will manage their government and plan their public future. Without that right, whatever else we may do seems partial.

Second, we must permit the District to reorganize its government along logical and efficient lines. The commissions form must give way to a strong executive-council form, because this is what works in today's America.

Third, we must vote the new laws requested for crime prevention and control, so that Washington will be a city where the lives and property of all its citizens are equally protected.

Fourth, we must establish a mechanism whereby the District will enjoy a voice and voting power in the Congress itself—for which there are many historic precedents.

Fifth, we must appropriate the funds which the President requested in his budget so that Washington can have the economic leverage needed to lift itself up and fulfill the rising expectations of its citizens and visitors. The health, housing, education, and job opportunities of the District's residents reflect well or badly on the health, housing, education, and job opportunities of the American Nation as a whole.

Sixth, we must maintain the reputation of Washington as a world capital—if not the world capital. This city is looked upon by those beyond our seas as a symbol of what is right with America and what is wrong. Let us make certain that we have done everything proposed in this message—and more—to make ours a model city in a model country.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, like other large cities, the District of Columbia is constantly faced with the most critical and urgent problems—crime in the streets, health, slum removal, economic and cultural opportunities, the administration of justice and the like.

The District not only has these problems; but also they are severely aggravated when the citizens of the District are denied the power possessed by citizens in other cities to govern their own affairs.

The President has carefully set forth his recommendations to the Congress as to how the goals of local self-government can finally and effectively be attained in the District.

The President's proposals are these: First, home rule; second, legislation to provide a nonvoting representation in the House of Representatives; and third, a proposed constitutional amendment which would provide the District full representation in the Congress.

These proposals are indeed worthy of support by the members. They will provide the citizens of the District of Columbia control over their local government and representation in our national government.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in his message on the National Capital, the President has asked us to set our goals for a capital city of which all Americans can be proud. And we should do nothing less than that. Yet, today, Washington is also a city of which the world must be proud, because it has become the capital of the world.

As we, in Congress, debate the overriding questions of war and peace, and as we seek new tools for the physical and human transformation of our cities and our institutions, we often forget that the District of Columbia demands our special attention because it is a symbol both of American Government and the American Nation. Unfortunately, and in spite of all the conscientious efforts of

the Congress and of the District government itself, the face of the Capital has been a shabby one, and traditional and new problems of an exploding metropolis have submerged our city in what seems to be a sea of hopelessness. And this is our city, no matter where we come from.

The President's message is a call to transform the District. It is a call to turn back the tide of hopelessness for too many of its citizens. It is a call to the Congress to release the potential energies of more than three-fourths million people who have been held back from the future by the dead hand of the past. It is a call to protect the lives and property of 2.5 million inhabitants of the Greater Washington area.

The President has now proposed a full battle plan, and I urge each of my colleagues to view it carefully with compassion, and to enlist himself as a soldier in the right war in the right place at the right time.

The President has asked us again to get on with the unfinished business of granting Washington home rule. This is so fundamental, so basic in a democratic nation that one wonders why the delay and hesitation. One hundred years ago home rule might not have been a necessity. We still accepted the philosophy of benevolent government paternalism. But, today, in the midst of triumphant self-government all around the world, how can we look down from this Hill and permit more than 800,000 people not to have their own freely elected representatives?

How can we permit our Capital not to reorganize its commission form of government—now almost a hundred years old—and replace it with a modern strong executive-type government which can act rapidly and intelligently in carrying out the people's business?

How can we not grant the President the funds which he has already asked in his budget for the improvement of health, welfare, job opportunity, housing, crime control and prevention, judicial reform, general administration, and beautification after we have read—and seen—the overwhelming crime rate, the congestion and deterioration, the lack of human opportunities which the District faces?

And how can we not be deeply sympathetic to the very clear and urgent request—which only we can grant—to approve voting representation, on a temporary or permanent basis, for the District in this very Congress of the United States?

And finally, beyond Washington as a mere city; beyond it as the seat of American Government; we are faced with Washington and its relationships to the world.

The President wants to enhance Washington's status as a world capital by facilitating the location of foreign chanceries; by establishing a center for scholars from our own land as well as from abroad.

The Congress of the United States has always had a very special and historic relationship to this city which symbolizes America to our own citizens and to citizens all over the world. Let us come together and support the President's pro-

gram for a new Washington, seeking not conformity of opinion, but unity of purpose for a finer, better, more peaceful, healthful, and more beautiful first city of this first Nation of the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the message from the President on the District of Columbia, which we received today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF SUCH COMMITTEE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 203 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 203

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Funds authorized for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Public Works for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 19, after the word "authorized", insert the word "are".

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 203 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the Committee on Public Works. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made one change which should be called to the attention of the House.

On page 2, line 19, after the word "authorized," the word "are" was inserted in order to explicitly explain the meaning of the paragraph pertaining to travel authorization of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 203 in order that the Committee on Public Works will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 203 was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Rules. I concur in the explanation that has just been made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I am about to make are not necessarily directed to the Committee on Public Works, or to any other one committee of the Congress, but I am very much disturbed by the lack of information concerning the spending of money as set forth in the publications authorized by law.

Mr. Speaker, I have in hand one such publication for the period of January 1 to June 30, 1966, the latest available to me, which is titled "Detailed Statement of Disbursements."

To put this in the proper perspective, section 60 of the Revised Statutes, 2 United States Code 102, provides in part as follows:

The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall prepare and submit to the two Houses, respectively, at the commencement of each session of Congress, the following statements in writing . . . A detailed statement, by items, of the manner in which the contingent fund for each House has been expended during the preceding year. This statement must give the names of every person to whom any portion of the fund has been paid; and if for anything furnished, the quantity and price; and if for any services rendered, the nature of such service, and the time employed, and the particular occasion or cause, in brief, that rendered such service necessary, and the amount of all former appropriations in each case on hand, either in the Treasury or in the hands of any disbursing officer or agent.

Reports of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives under this section shall be printed as Senate and House documents, respectively.

Reading from this document of alleged detailed statements of disbursements:

Eastern Airlines Inc., official travel for members of staff of Committee on Educa-

tion and Labor, March 1 through March 24, 1966, \$1,214.23.

Again we find:

Eastern Airlines, official travel for members of staff of Committee on Education and Labor, March 8 through March 24, 1966, \$3,704.26.

Mr. Speaker, does the listing of these expenditures conform to the statute and, if not, why has the law not been adhered to?

If we had the detailed information on these two items alone, we might well have some of the answers two committees of the Congress apparently failed to get.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time chairmen of the various committees give to the Congress the information the statute provides, not the abbreviated accounting such as is to be found in all too many instances in the statements of disbursements from the contingency fund of the House of Representatives.

I was also attracted to another item in this particular statement of disbursements which shows the purchase of lapel pins and charm bracelets—November 22 to November 30, 1965.

Who in the world is getting lapel pins and charm bracelets?

I noted in the paper the other day a news story that Members of the other body apparently have voted themselves chipped diamond lapel pins. Can this be the bill for Members of the other body? Who gets the charm bracelets? Are Members of the other body or are Members of the House wearing charm bracelets these days?

Mr. Speaker, the expenditures as provided by law ought to be listed in the book in detail as the law requires.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO MAKE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 168) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 168

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1967, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; and the administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions which impede the free flow of air commerce; promotion of travel and tourism; routes, rates, accounts, and subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace, aircraft, and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; air navigational aids and traffic control; and the administration by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency of the statutes which they administer.

(3) Allocation of radio spectrum; pay television; ownership, control, and operations of communications and related facilities; policies with respect to competition among various modes of communication, including voice and record communications and data processing; policies with respect to governmental communications systems; coordination of communication policies both domestic and foreign; impact of foreign operations, international agreements, and international organizations on domestic and foreign communications; technical developments in the communications field; and the administration by the Federal Communications Commission and the Director of Telecommunications Management of statutes which they administer.

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various securities Acts; and the administration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission, and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies; and the administration by the Federal Power Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling; and the administration by the Federal Trade Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; and the operations of the Weather Bureau.

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; and other matters relating to public health; and the operations of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials.

(12) Traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States; factors responsible for such accidents, the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for increased traffic and motor vehicle safety.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, after line 21, add the following paragraph:

"Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

On page 5, after line 14, add the following paragraphs:

"Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illi-

nois [Mr. ANDERSON], and myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 168 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made two changes which should be called to the attention of the House.

The first amendment simply adds the following language:

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

This is the same provision which already appears in most of the resolutions of this type and the Committee on Rules is trying to be fair to all committees alike in this provision to eliminate duplicate investigations.

The second amendment adds three additional paragraphs concerning the use of counterpart funds and the reporting of the costs of such overseas travel as is necessary. These additional paragraphs which were added to this resolution are contained in other similar types of resolutions which authorize the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 168 in order that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be available to them.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members on this side of the aisle, I would state that this is the standard investigative resolution. It was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Rules, and I join the able gentleman from Florida in urging the House to adopt House Resolution 168.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments to the resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST THINGS FIRST IN SPENDING

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a little over 3 months ago, the administration announced an immediate cutback in construction funds for the Federal-aid highway program. Congress was told that

the cutback would amount to \$700 million, or 17½ percent of the proposed construction commencing during fiscal year 1967. The excuse given was that the program represented nonessential, nondefense spending at a time when economic pressure was great because of the war in Vietnam. To say I was amazed at this pronouncement coming from the Johnson administration is to put it mildly.

It has always been my understanding that the primary reason for the passage of the 1956 act which authorized the 41,000-mile Interstate System was because it would provide the means to move great quantities of military and defense equipment from point A to point B overland in the shortest amount of time; whether that material and equipment should traverse the Nation from north to south or east to west. Congress even saw fit to title this impressive system of roadways the "National System of Defense and Interstate Highways." Let me repeat that word "defense."

Apparently, the administration has either forgotten or ignored both the intent of Congress in titling the act and its subsequent mandate that the system should be completed by 1972. By its recent action, the administration has turned away from the congressional declaration that the system's primary importance is for the national defense and that prompt and early completion of the highway network is essential to the best interests of this Nation.

The statement made that this important program must be cut back due to the exigencies of Vietnam would seem to have been directed, not at the Congress, but at those who would believe such a charge. Members of Congress cannot accept this statement as fact. Not for one minute can it be reasonably contended the Interstate System should be subordinated to such projects as demonstration cities or wasteful and ineffective poverty programs and, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] so aptly said, "the planting of posies along the highways." It would seem to me that our great Nation must have priorities in spending somewhere. For example, who among us would question the importance of the Interstate System as opposed to the Highway Beautification Act? If our priorities are in such a state of disarray, then we ought to act to straighten them out. I say let us stop politics in spending and continue with the work that must be done.

Mr. Speaker, the Interstate System is a little over half complete. It is not likely that it will be completed on schedule by 1972 or even 1975. No one can say, however, that the Congress, the States, and the roadbuilding industry have not tried to accomplish this objective on time. Time after time, since 1956, the Congress has passed laws to speed up this work. The several States have met the Federal Government more than half way in planning and meeting obligations to insure that the work would move along on schedule. The roadbuilding industry has geared itself to the almost herculean task and is prepared to see it through to fruition. The initial problems that seemed so large in the be-

ginning have been overcome. But now it appears—if the President will have his way—the Congress will have been misled, the States will lose the trust they have gained through the Federal partnership, and the roadbuilding industry will have to face the hard reality of completing contracts which already have been committed and, in all probability, lay off skilled workers who were initially hired to do the work that had to be done.

What is surprising is that the decision to cut back should come from the President, who has often stated his desire to see the system completed on time. He was instrumental, as majority leader of the Senate, in guiding the legislation through that body in 1956. What is even more surprising is that somehow, for some reason yet unknown, the President has changed his mind. Surely the President is cognizant of the fact that to delay this program is to add an additional financial burden to it. The simplest economic principles manifest this truth.

Mr. Speaker, because of increasing values placed on most real estate, rights-of-way acquisition are becoming more financially cumbersome. As the program rapidly moves toward property close to urban areas, property values increase. The program is now at the point where it will be necessary to obtain rights-of-way in and around a number of large metropolitan areas in the near future to insure the system's planned completion. Construction costs are on the rise. Since 1963, they have increased an average of 2½ percent annually, except for the unusual peak increase of 8 percent last year. It is probable that these costs will level off at an approximate 3-percent annual increase, though this is conjecture. Because of the increases in construction costs and the increasing cost of obtaining rights-of-way as the program approaches metropolitan areas, I am convinced that in order to complete the job we started out to do in 1956 at a minimum amount of cost, we ought to go ahead as planned.

It has been estimated that upon the completion of the system America would be spared a large part of the tragic loss of 8,000 lives each year. Even the President has acknowledged this. Let me quote from a statement he made upon the occasion of signing into public law the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1964. At that time, the President had this to say:

In every respect it (the Interstate System) has met our hopes. It is already saving 3,000 lives a year and, by 1972, it will be saving 8,000 a year.

What this all boils down to then is: Do we set priorities so that we can eventually save 8,000 American lives each year, or do we plant "posies"? Do we go along with the administration in funding other less significant programs that should be deferred at this time, or do we go along with the clear intent of Congress in building a system of defense highways second to none in the world? I do not think there is any question but that we have a choice and we ought to get on with this work that needs to be done.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of this body, I am well aware that the money for this program does not come out of the general fund of the Treasury. This network of roads is being paid for in full by the people who use them—the American public who travel over the Nation's secondary and primary highways. It is being paid for by a trust fund which was organized to finance the system and which is kept solvent from taxes placed on highway users. I believe this is one of the most sensible ways to finance this type program. The trust fund should remain a trust as its name implies and the Federal Government should not transfer money from the fund to other projects.

I am concerned because of what this and other proposed cutbacks in highway funding will mean for the State of New Hampshire. At this point I would like to have inserted into the body of the RECORD two letters I have received in response to my request for additional information regarding the seriousness of the cutbacks as it affects New Hampshire. The first letter is from the commissioner of the Department of Public Works and Highways of the State of New Hampshire, Mr. John O. Morton. Mr. Morton's letter clearly outlines the adverse effects the imposed cutback will have on my State. Along with the letter, I would include in the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent to the commissioner from the American Association of State Highway Officials and his reply which states his response to the questionnaire contained in the body of the telegram. The second letter is from Mr. Joseph Foster, chairman of the New Hampshire Highway Users Conference:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WORKS AND
HIGHWAYS,

Concord, N.H., January 25, 1967.

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LOUIS: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a questionnaire developed by the American Association of State Highway Officials for the purpose of assessing, on a nationwide basis, the effects of the recent cutback in Federal funds earmarked for the Federal highway construction program. Attached to the questionnaire is the response that I have developed. My response is intended to document the seriousness of the situation we are currently confronted with in New Hampshire.

I have some appreciation of the fact that when cuts are made in Federally supported programs it usually attracts an array of protests; however, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not express to you my views as they relate to the seriousness of this situation.

The highway construction program in any state is one that substantially contributes to the welfare of the people. It is a program that involves a wide variety of activities, many of which are of great complexity. Such a program cannot be turned on or off at a moment's notice without creating huge economic losses at both the State and Federal level. The present highway construction program is not providing the facilities that our expanding population and our greatly increased volumes of traffic require.

New Interstate expressways, modern feeder roads, and highway construction in urban areas are making valuable contributions in

the field of highway safety. With the public of this nation now aroused to the seriousness of highway accidents, it is most inconsistent that the program should now be curtailed.

Highway contractors are representative of most small business enterprises. They have, in the past few years, geared themselves to handle a high level of construction activity. They have made extensive commitments predicated on a continued level of construction activity. They will require work to retain their equipment and maintain a sound financial position. Failure to obtain work will, without question, cause a series of failures in the construction industry. These failures will produce widespread hardships in many of the industries that are allied to highway construction.

I anticipate that in the next month or two, highway officials from all parts of the nation will gather in Washington for the purpose of appearing before the appropriate committees of Congress to present testimony as to the seriousness of the present cutback.

I hope that the information I am supplying you with at this time will prove to be meaningful and helpful. If I can be of additional assistance, please feel free to call on me for it.

With my kindest regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN O. MORTON,
Commissioner.

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 19, 1967.

JOHN O. MORTON,
Commissioner, Department of Public Works
and Highways, Concord, N.H.:

Please furnish in concise summary form listed under appropriate captions your answers to the following questions that will be used during AASHO's appearance before the Public Works Committee.

(1) How much of your 1967 fiscal year planned program, expressed both in money value and percentage, did the cutback of November 23, 1966, reduce scheduled lettings for the 1967 fiscal year?

(2) How is the November 23 cutback affecting your department personnel and work schedule?

(3) Are you able to reassign affected personnel to other tasks or is there any possibility that you will have to release personnel if the cutback continues past July 1, 1967?

(4) Do you have sufficient competent personnel to carry on the full amount of the highway program without diversely affecting the quality of the finished product? Statements have been made in Washington that the slowdown is beneficial to some degree because the highway departments have a shortage in certain professional and engineering personnel and have problems in retaining sufficient personnel to do the job, also that the slowdown will give an opportunity for needed additional planning in urban areas.

(5) Will the November 23 slowdown result in a benefit to your State by allowing any needed urban transportation planning to proceed?

(6) What adjustments have you made in your department operations and program, because of the November 23 cutback?

(A) Are you proceeding with engineering work or are you slowing down this activity?

(B) Are you using State funds that would have been used for matching Federal-aid to finance State construction?

(C) Are you reducing interstate work in favor of ABC projects?

(D) Other effects.

(7) As a result of the November 23 cutback, what is the money value of contracts that you can award during the remaining part of the 1967 fiscal year?

(8) In your opinion, is the highway cutback adversely affecting the economy of your State? If so, in what regard and to what degree?

(9) In case an additional 400 million dollar highway cutback for the 1967 fiscal year is ordered (presumably this would all be deducted from the last and remaining fiscal year quarterly allotment)

(A) What would be the total dollar value of highway lettings that could be awarded during the remaining part of the 1967 fiscal year?

(B) What would be the effect on your personnel of this additional cutback?

(C) Any additional observations or pertinent remarks.

A. E. JOHNSON,
Executive Director, American Association
of State Highway Officials.

COMMISSIONER MORTON'S RESPONSE TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

The following material is supplied in response to the questions that were posed in your telegram dated January 19, 1967. The answers that have been supplied clearly indicate that it is impossible to turn the Highway Program off and on at a moment's notice. The operation of a Highway Department is one of large proportions and considerable complexity. The Highway Department organization is created over a period of time in which a large number of people have been specially trained to function as a unit. I would hope that this point would be strongly emphasized to the appropriate members of Congress.

1. \$11,017,000 36%.

2. Cutback not affecting personnel at this time. During winter months there is very little active construction, and field personnel are on their regular winter office assignments. Regular work schedule proceeding except that completed plans will be held until funds are available.

3. No reassignment yet. Will not release personnel. Past experience dictates that it is almost impossible and extremely costly to replace trained personnel when they are needed.

4. We have sufficient trained personnel to carry on the full program. At the time of the cutback we were on schedule. Our Federal-aid Urban funds are so small that we do not need additional time for urban area planning.

5. No.

6. (A) Proceeding with engineering work, no slowdown.

(B) Under the terms established by our State Legislature we are unable to transfer the Federal-aid matching funds to any other purpose.

(C) No. We are making every effort to retain a balanced program.

(D) The contracting and allied industries will be seriously affected.

7. \$14,666,000.

8. Yes. There will be a substantial reduction in contractors' payrolls, in the purchase of equipment and materials, in trucking and other forms of transportation, and in the many services that are associated with construction activity. As the effects of these reductions spread to other areas, the total effect on the State's economy might be as much as 5%.

9. (A) \$10,602,000

(B) There could be some reassignment of duties and a substantial reduction in, or the complete elimination of the temporary summer employment of college engineering students and high school graduates.

(C) We have received critical comments from the press, from legislators, and from local officials in areas where construction has to be delayed. In New Hampshire the Federal-aid construction program represents 95% of our entire construction program. In view of this situation, the consequences of the cutback are extremely serious.

It is impossible to materially reduce a highway construction program without

greatly increasing the administrative and organizational costs of a highway department. Large sums of money have been expended by a state to improve the skills of highway management, and to equip, through a variety of special training programs, personnel engaged in engineering, right of way, traffic, safety, and highway beautification programs. Once these people are eliminated from a Highway Department organization it is a lengthy and costly process to replace them.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. MORTON,
Commissioner.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HIGHWAY
USERS CONFERENCE,
Concord, N.H., December 23, 1966.

Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Manchester, N.H.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN-ELECT WYMAN: By action of the membership of the New Hampshire Highway Users Conference, at its annual meeting on December 9, I am writing to members of our State Congressional Delegation to protest the recent drastic cutback ordered by the Federal Government in Federal "aid" highway funds previously apportioned to the states for the current fiscal year. We ask that you do all you can to have these funds restored.

In the case of New Hampshire, this cutback will mean the loss of \$3,236,245 to be held back from the \$18,657,245 originally apportioned.

In the discussion preceding adoption of the motion to appeal to the New Hampshire Congressional Delegation, the following points were brought out:

(1) The validity of the reason given in messages sent by the Bureau of Public Roads to Federal regional and division engineers is subject to challenge, i.e., "In recognition of the need for reducing non-military Federal expenditures as contribution to the Vietnam effort and the resultant program to reduce inflationary pressures."

(2) The resultant slow-down of the road program will not only defer the completion date of the Interstate System, but will also result in economic loss and hardship to New Hampshire road-building contractors and the loss of jobs to some of their employees.

(3) Accrual of revenues to the Federal Highway Trust Fund from continued collection of the present highway user taxes could result in a substantial excess of such revenues and offer great temptation to divert this money to other governmental purposes.

In connection with point 3, a good deal of apprehension was expressed by several members that continuation of the cutback over any considerable period of time would almost certainly lead to proposals for "borrowing" from the Highway Trust Fund, or outright diversion, for purposes having no relationship to highway construction. Accordingly, the Conference went on record as reiterating its strong policy against the use of any part of the Highway Trust Fund for any purpose except highways.

We hope that you will assist in every way possible toward the early restoration of these funds.

Most respectfully,

JOSEPH FOSTER,
Chairman.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that in light of the many problems which will be created around the Nation by the application of this and other proposed cutbacks in this very essential program, the President will reconsider his decision. I believe we must put first things first in spending and that the Federal-aid highway program and its Interstate System ought to be numbered among those at the top of the list.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLISM CONTROL BILL

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to remedy some of the serious problems in the Nation's Capital brought about by the Federal court decision in the case of Easter against the District of Columbia.

As a result of that decision, an administrative condition of near chaos exists in the District with regard to treatment of chronic alcoholics. It is apparent that neither law enforcement nor public health authorities in Washington, D.C., were prepared for the impact of a court ruling that chronic alcoholics, as victims of a medically recognized disease, cannot be dealt with under the criminal code.

Thus, because of a shortage of medical facilities and the inadequacy of programs to deal with alcoholism, the spirit, if not in fact the judicial letter, of the Easter case is being violated daily.

Nearly a year has passed since the Easter decision, but confusion still reigns as to what that ruling means.

It does not mean that alcoholism is a legal defense for the violation of National, State, or local laws.

It does not mean unlawful use of alcoholic beverages, public drunkenness, or disorderly conduct are excusable or to be excused under our law.

What it does mean is that a person found upon medical determination to be a chronic alcoholic—that is, someone who is habitually and obsessively drunk and, who for all practical purposes, cannot control his conduct and therefore needs specialized medical assistance—that person is properly the responsibility of community public health rather than law enforcement agencies.

Experience has taught us that dealing with public inebriates as criminals is expensive to the community, burdensome to our law enforcement agencies, and futile in the administration of justice.

Yet, while police and law enforcement officials are expending time and resources on this noncriminal problem—one that in most of the countries of the world is dealt with by public health, not law enforcement agencies—our District crime rate increases.

Unfortunately, as we have seen, the Easter decision cannot be properly implemented under present conditions here. Washington, D.C., officials were and are insufficiently prepared for the transition in treatment of chronic alcoholics which the Easter decision requires.

I say this not as a blanket criticism of the Washington, D.C., police force and court system, already overburdened, overextended, and, in my opinion, over-criticized in many areas.

Nor is it surprising that District of Columbia public health officials were and are unprepared to meet the greatly enlarged responsibilities that the decision places upon them.

No, the fact is that the near-chaotic conditions which now exist, reflect a total community shortsightedness with regard to the problem of alcoholism. Worse yet, it reflects a national attitude. I am certain that the vast majority of communities throughout the country would fall short, as has the National Capital, in responding to the need for change placed upon it by the Easter decision.

What can be done? We cannot ignore the problem any longer, unless Washington, D.C., the community where the Nation's laws are made, is in effect to operate in contempt of court for inability to conform to the new legal interpretation regarding chronic alcoholics.

Clearly, the District of Columbia needs a comprehensive new program to meet its community responsibility under the Easter ruling—a crash program, considering the present state of affairs.

As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I have been especially concerned with the impact of the Easter decision on the National Capital community, and have therefore followed this situation with intense interest. The legislation which I introduce here today will, I believe, go far toward alleviating the current crisis. It is my hope that it will also serve to make the Nation's Capital a pilot example for other American communities which will soon be faced with this same problem.

Briefly, the Hagan alcoholism care and control bill establishes a Bureau of Alcoholism Control within the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, with a qualified program director in charge of community services for inebriates and chronic alcoholics.

The bill provides for one or more detoxification centers located in the District, with a capacity of at least 200 beds. As we know, District authorities, because of a shortage of such facilities within the District, are currently using facilities many miles away, in Virginia.

The bill also provides for inpatient extended care facilities for study, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, and for outpatient aftercare facilities, including not only clinics, but social centers, rehabilitation services, and half-way houses, with a capacity of at least 2,000 beds.

And the bill also sets up adequate safeguards for protection of individual constitutional rights of those persons who fall within the purview of its provisions.

The Nation's Capital needs legislation of this order, and needs it quickly. The existing situation with regard to treatment of alcoholics is so serious as to require congressional attention, and with the agreement of District of Columbia Committee Chairman McMILLAN, I intend to call for early hearings at which officials of District law enforcement and public health agencies will be heard on this subject. An on-the-spot investigation of existing facilities is also planned.

We are witnessing in the Nation's Capital a court-ordered reformation in community treatment of alcoholics—a reformation which will soon be extended to cover communities throughout the country. For, make no mistake, the Easter

ter case, and the ruling of the Fourth Federal Circuit Court in the case of Driver against Hinnant, are forerunners to similar decisions which will soon affect every American community.

As I have said, what we do here in the Nation's Capital can be a notable pilot case—or a horrible pilot example—for these other communities. In the aftermath of the Easter case, Congress therefore has no alternative. We must enact legislation to deal with the problems of the disease of alcoholism—and the chronic alcoholic, the victim of that disease—and we must act quickly and effectively in the interests of the National Capital community and the country as a whole.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE OHIO RIVER CANAL STORY

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, later this year the Congress will be asked to consider many appropriations bills. One of the most important is the public works appropriations bill which will contain funds for the Corps of Engineers' civil works projects.

In the rush of trying to adjourn last fall we passed the public works appropriation bill for 1967, I believe, without proper and full debate. The result was that we included in that bill a \$500,000 appropriation for advance planning and design of the infamous Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal without being able to bring that item to a record vote.

Considering the controversy which has surrounded this "billion dollar boondoggle," it is odd that the proponents of the bill were afraid to put into the record their votes in support of it. It is possible they do not want their constituents back home to know they voted for this "pork barrel"?

Today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House two recent developments in this continuing Ohio River Canal story which should be investigated.

On Thursday, February 16—just 1 week ago—the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' district office in Pittsburgh opened bids for the first phase of the planning and design of the canal. These bids were for drilling test holes along the route of the canal. The Engineers, in their laudatory, expansive, and glowing report in favor of the canal last year estimated that these test borings between Warren and Ashtabula, Ohio, would cost a mere \$65,770.

Imagine their surprise when they discovered the low bid submitted by the Pennsylvania Drilling Co., of McKees Rocks, Pa., was \$74,934. It is simple mathematics to figure out that the Corps of Engineers had underestimated costs by a whopping 7 percent.

I ask my colleagues in the House: if the Corps of Engineers can underesti-

mate this small phase of the canal boondoggle by 7 percent, why could not their entire estimate on the canal be off by 7 percent—or even more? The Corps of Engineers has optimistically said the canal will cost only \$1,025 million. Do you realize that a mere 7 percent underestimation in the overall cost would add \$71 million to the total bill for this "pie-in-the-sky."

I would now like to go on to another facet of the canal controversy. We all know that the organization which has spent more time and more money to lobby for the canal is called Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., located in Columbus, Ohio. In the past few weeks they have been caught acting in what has been termed "improper and possibly illegal" activities in behalf of the canal. What they have done is approach local jurisdictions along the route of the proposed canal and request these local governments to provide easements and rights-of-way to the Federal Government without cost.

The Corps of Engineers here in Washington was informed by me of this activity and they admitted that Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., had no jurisdiction to request these easements. The Engineers explained that several years from now, when the planning for the canal is completed, the corps will appoint some State or local agency as the sponsoring agency. Only at this time will this empowered agent be able to request easements and rights-of-way.

No agency at this time has this authority and the Engineers point out that the actions of this lobbying group are premature and improper.

The question to ask is why is Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., undertaking this improper lobbying now when it has no permission or right to do so. I will tell you—it is because local opposition to the canal is fast crystalizing, and if the backers of the canal do not obtain easements now, they may never be able to.

Already local jurisdictions are beginning to realize that the canal will not be all perfume and roses. It will result in heavy costs to them, on the State, county, township and city level. They will have to pay millions of dollars for highway and railroad bridge maintenance and replacement. They will have to repay the State for money allocated or expenses incurred on the local government's behalf, and they will have to share the cost of bridge alterations.

And just as important, this canal, tearing through the centers of many towns along the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, will take off the local tax rolls many thousands of acres of prime industrial, business, and personal real estate.

We have positive proof that the proponents of the canal are worried. They seek opposition banding together in greater numbers each day. They have obviously changed their tune. A year ago they were all confidence. Now they are running scared. Our distinguished colleague from Youngstown, Ohio, who has long led the fight for the canal, admitted in public on February 14 that if

local jurisdictions along the canal route fail to support the canal, its future is uncertain.

All those of us who oppose this canal as an unmoded, outdated, overexpensive and useless project must now work harder than ever before. Our cause is just; our foes admit they are scared. We must ask the Corps of Engineers point-blank why their initial estimates are way off. We must explain to local governmental bodies the true facts of what this project will cost them. We must explain to each and every interested citizen how this canal will hurt, not help them and their industries and jobs.

The time to act is now.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, a letter dated February 20, 1967, addressed to the Speaker from the Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a summary of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
February 20, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft bill, the "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967".

This draft bill would carry out the recommendations with respect to the juvenile delinquency contained in the President's Message to the Congress on Welfare of Children.

We should appreciate it if you would refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Under Secretary.

SUMMARY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1967

PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS (TITLE I, PART A)

a. Grants would be authorized to State or community public agencies to meet up to 90 percent of the cost of preparing or revising comprehensive State-wide or community-wide plans. The Secretary could make such planning a condition to receipt of any other aid under this title in the State or community.

b. Also authorized would be grants to State agencies to meet up to 90 per cent of the cost of provision of technical assistance in youth services to local agencies.

c. Grants to up to 90 per cent of the cost of planning for programs or projects eligible for aid under the bill would also be authorized.

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES (TITLE I, PART B)

a. Grants by the Secretary of HEW, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, would be authorized to any public agency for projects or programs for diagnosing,

treating, and rehabilitating delinquent youths.¹

b. To secure a grant a public agency would file an application which assures that—

1. the agency will coordinate its activities with those of other agencies providing health, education, welfare and other basic services in the community, will make reasonable efforts to secure any of these needed services which are not otherwise available, but with maximum use of other Federal, State, or local resources;

2. there will be consultation with local service agencies in formulating the project or program, as well as agencies involved in the correction process.

The application must also contain a description of the youth services available in the community, a statement of the method or methods of linking the service agencies, and a showing that the project or program is consistent with any plans developed under the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967.

c. In passing upon applications, consideration would be given to, among other relevant local factors,

1. relative costs and effectiveness of projects and programs;

2. incidence of youth offenses and juvenile delinquency;

3. school drop-out rates;

4. adequacy of facilities and services;

5. extent of local comprehensive planning.

d. Grant funds could be used for paying up to 60 per cent of the cost of securing or providing otherwise unavailable essential services prescribed by the Secretary, and for up to 50 percent of the cost of construction of unusual, and special purpose or innovative, facilities which the Secretary finds necessary for the program. The usual prevailing wage requirements would be applicable to construction aided under the bill.

PREVENTIVE SERVICES (TITLE I, PART C)

a. Grants would be authorized to local public or nonprofit agencies or organizations for projects or programs for securing or provision (where not otherwise available) of special diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquent who need them to prevent or control juvenile delinquency.

b. To secure a grant, a local community public or nonprofit agency or organization would file an application which assures, in addition generally to the assurances and information required under part B, that—

1. the agency or organization will assume responsibility for seeing to it that at least those health, education, welfare, and basic services which the Secretary specifies as necessary will be provided in the community for youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming so;

2. special efforts to make services available to youths with serious behavioral problems;

3. appropriate youth participation in formulation and operation of the program.

¹ Parts B and C, taken together, would provide services to youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent, whatever their legal status. The services provided under part B and part C may be similar, but the auspices are different. Part B is addressed to law enforcement agencies, courts, and other correctional institutions and the youths with whom they deal. Part C is addressed to community agencies and the youths with whom they deal. The two parts are so designed as to promote more interaction between these two kinds of agencies, more use by correctional agencies of community services, and a tendency, whenever appropriate, to render services to youths without identifying them as delinquent or placing them in custody.

c. In passing on applications, consideration would be given to various relevant factors, including those which apply in the case of part B.

d. Grant funds could be used to meet up to 75% of the cost of needed diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative services which are otherwise unavailable in the community, but only to the extent and for the period reasonably necessary for the community to provide them from other sources.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TITLE II)

a. Grants to or contracts with State, local, or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions would be authorized for research and demonstration projects which have promise of making a substantial contribution to improvement in preventive, treatment, and rehabilitative services for delinquents or potential delinquents. Such contracts could also be made with other private groups and with individuals. Direct conduct of such activities by the Secretary would also be authorized.

b. The Secretary would be authorized to conduct research and to cooperate with and provide technical assistance to public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions, with respect to preventive, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or potential delinquents, and to provide short-term technical training.

c. The Secretary would also be authorized to collect, evaluate, publish and disseminate information and materials relating to research and other matters relating to delinquency and potential delinquency.

GENERAL (TITLE III)

a. Appointment of committees would be authorized to advise on general policy and on coordination of activities under the bill and related activities.

b. The appropriation of \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 and necessary sums for next 4 fiscal years would be authorized.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1967—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

Planning and technical assistance grants (title I, part A)

Authorizes grants to meet up to 90 percent of the cost:

1. To State or community public agencies for comprehensive planning;

2. To State agencies for provision of technical assistance in youth services to local agencies;

3. For planning for programs or projects eligible for aid under the bill.

Rehabilitative services (title I, part B)

Authorizes grants to meet up to 60 percent of the cost of unavailable essential services and 50 percent of the cost of construction of unusual and special purpose or innovative facilities to any public agency for projects or programs for diagnosing, treating, and rehabilitating delinquent youth, provided that the agency assures it will coordinate with and make maximum use of other relevant agency activities and will consult with local service and correctional agencies in formulating its activities.

Preventive services (title I, part C)

Authorizes grants to meet up to 75 percent of the cost to local public or nonprofit agencies for projects or programs for securing or providing special diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquent who need them to prevent or control juvenile delinquency. The grantee must assure, in addition to assurances required under title I, part B, that it will assume responsibility to see that necessary services are provided for such youth in the community; that special efforts are made on behalf of youth with serious behavioral problems; and that there is provision for youth participa-

tion in formulation and operation of the program.

Research and technical assistance (title II)

Authorizes grants to or contracts with State, local, or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions for research and demonstration projects which have promise of making a substantial contribution to improvement in preventive, treatment, or rehabilitative services for delinquents or potential delinquents. Authorizes Secretary to conduct research and to cooperate with and provide technical assistance to public and private groups with respect to such services, and to provide short-term technical training. Authorizes Secretary to collect, evaluate, publish and disseminate information and materials relating to research and other matters pertaining to actual or potential delinquency.

General (title III)

The appropriation of \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 and necessary sums for the next four fiscal years would be authorized.

GAYLORD P. GODWIN

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Gaylord P. Godwin is retiring from United Press International which he has served with distinction for 40 years.

Mr. Godwin is a native of my State and an alumnus of my alma mater, the University of Missouri, where we both were graduated from the school of journalism.

We also share a deep interest in agriculture, as evidenced by my long service on the House Committee on Agriculture and his coverage of the Department of Agriculture for UPI since 1955.

He began his career as a wire service reporter at Kansas City in 1927, immediately after his graduation. He was transferred successively to United Press offices at Oklahoma City, Chicago, Madison, Wis., Omaha, Nebr., and Washington.

He was still a cub reporter when he covered the impeachment and removal from office of Oklahoma's Gov. Henry S. Johnston in 1929. The following years brought other important political assignments—a "beat," the reporter's constant goal, when Wendell Willkie withdrew as a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1944; continuing coverage of Nebraska's 1948 presidential preferential primary election in which all candidates, announced or merely possible, were entered with or without their consent.

Like all wire service reporters, he was not limited to a single subject. He covered, with equal competence, executions and spelling bees, football games and track meets, blizzards, and floods.

He was respected by the men and women whose activities he covered—as well as by those with whom he worked—as a blunt-spoken, no-nonsense reporter. He did not take kindly to interference.

His friends remember with delight his response to a Post Office Department offi-

cial of some years ago who protested that a Godwin story about that Department had not been secured through proper channels.

The reporter said:

Don't you tell me how to get a story, and I won't tell you how to lick a stamp.

Mr. and Mrs. Godwin will leave next month for their new home at Manteo, N.C. With them go our best wishes. They will be missed.

HOW MANY RED SPIES PER YEAR?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, why does not the State Department tell us who the 18,000 American travelers in Russia are, in whose interest they travel in Russia, and who is paying their expenses?

As a father-taxpayer, one of 190 million Americans, I am given to understand that the Soviet Consular Treaty is to offer some security to 18,000 Americans who travel annually behind the Communist Iron Curtain. This apparently is the State Department's chief selling point on public opinion. Yet, we 190 million are being asked to place our country, our lives, and our property in additional jeopardy for the benefit of 18,000 people, only 20 of whom were arrested according to State Department records. Certainly, we people are entitled to a full disclosure of all the facts.

Pending before Congress and our Nation is this most crucial decision of whether or not the Soviet Consular Convention, or Treaty, should be ratified. I continue to receive a heavy flow of mail from my constituents and from citizens all over the country who fear for the safety and defense of our America and the risk of any treaty involvement with the Communists. They raise questions that I am unable to answer and that I have not heard discussed nor adequately presented to the public from any of the administration sources.

In the interest of public opinion and academic freedom regarding this Communist treaty convention, I have a study prepared by Mr. W. B. Hicks, Jr., executive secretary of Liberty Lobby and which, I am told, was delivered before the appropriate committee. The benefit of his remarks and study was given very little exposure to the American people and certainly we, in Congress, do not want to hide any of the facts or arguments so vital to national defense and our individual survival.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Mr. Hicks' complete statement into the RECORD for the reading and study of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF W. B. HICKS, JR., EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, LIBERTY LOBBY, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON SOVIET CONSULAR CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 17, 1967

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I am W. B. Hicks, Jr., Executive Secretary of Liberty Lobby. I appear today to

oppose the Soviet Consular Convention in the name of the 170,000 subscribers to the *Liberty Letter*, our monthly legislative report. I have been authorized to take this position by our Board of Policy which, at the moment, is made up of some 10,000 of our subscribers who have joined our Board of Policy in order to take a more active role in the Liberty Lobby. Our Board of Policy has voted overwhelmingly to support a pro-American foreign policy and it is our belief that this treaty with the Soviet Union fails to meet that standard.

We will restrict our testimony on the treaty to a summary of the arguments and counter-arguments for and against the treaty, as they are currently being presented by the State Department, the press, in letters from Senators to their constituents, and by those actively opposing the treaty.

First, the arguments put forward in support of the treaty, each followed by the counter-argument of the opposition.

1. *Argument:* If ratified, the Convention would bring important and immediate benefits to the 18,000 or more American citizens who travel to the U.S.S.R. each year.

Counter-argument: The only benefit to the ordinary American traveler in the Soviet Union would be access to American consular offices in the limited number of cities in the U.S.S.R. where consulates may be established. According to the State Department, only one such location (Leningrad) is now contemplated. Travelers in any other cities would not be aided unless they happened to be arrested. Since June of 1964, when the treaty was signed, only 20 Americans have been arrested by the Soviet Union. The benefits of this treaty would apply to these 20 but not to the 18,000 per year claimed by the State Department.

2. *Argument:* The treaty will protect Americans arrested by the Soviet Union.

Counter-argument: The protection offered by the treaty consists solely of visiting rights by consular officials. There are no concessions by the Soviets to American standards of justice. There is no provision for jury trial. There is no provision against self-incrimination. There is no provision for facing one's accuser. There is no provision against cruel or unusual punishment. Contrary to the statement on the Senate floor of one supporter of the treaty, there is no provision for release of a prisoner.

3. *Argument:* The treaty offers an unusual (for the Soviet Union) right of access to American prisoners by consular officials.

Counter-argument: The right of notification and access to arrested Americans within four days of their confinement is unusual only in the Soviet Union. This right of access has always been granted by the United States and most other civilized nations. In fact, at the time the United States recognized the Soviet Union over thirty years ago, the Soviet Government promised the immediate implementation of this right of access. This promise was never carried out.

4. *Argument:* If this right of access had been in effect, Newcomb Mott (the American who died while imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. last year), might still be alive.

Counter-argument: This argument is based on the assumption that Newcomb Mott committed suicide in a fit of despair. There is just as much reason to believe that he was murdered by fellow prisoners on his prison train. Further, it assumed that Mott's despair resulted from lack of contact with Americans rather than the circumstances of his trial and prospective "punishment."

In a more recent case, that of Mr. Kazan, no protection at all would have been forthcoming under the proposed treaty because the Soviets turned him over to a Czechoslovakian court for trial. Nothing in the treaty would prevent the Soviets from adopting this procedure as a standard practice to

avoid the access provisions of the treaty if it is ratified.

5. *Argument:* American personnel who serve as officers and employees in any consulates we may establish in the U.S.S.R. must have the protection of diplomatic immunity offered by this treaty.

Counter-argument: This argument assumes that the necessity for American consulates and personnel is taken for granted. Therefore, its validity depends entirely on first proving the necessity for additional U.S. diplomatic offices in the Soviet Union.

6. *Argument:* American consulates in the Soviet Union will offer valuable "windows" on the "closed society" of the U.S.S.R.

Counter-argument: Diplomatic officials who have served in the Soviet Union have complained of the extensive restrictions placed upon their movement and activities by the Soviet Government. The very fact that the Soviet Union is a "closed society" necessarily means that useful observations are more difficult to obtain for our personnel there than for Soviet personnel stationed in the United States. It follows that we would obtain little useful information in comparison to what the Soviets would gain by having offices in cities in this Nation where they are presently not allowed to operate.

In addition, the difficulties of maintaining security in an American consulate in the U.S.S.R. (against "bugging" and other electronic devices) might in fact make our consulate more of a "window" on our diplomatic operations, for the Soviets.

7. *Argument:* The convention does not provide for the opening of consulates, either in the United States or in the U.S.S.R. It provides for no new Soviet personnel in this country.

Counter-argument: This argument is pure sophistry, beneath the dignity of even the State Department. Immediately following Article 1 of the treaty, which contains a definition of terms, follows the title of the next five articles: "Opening of consular establishments, appointment of consular officers and employees," and the content of Articles 2 through 6 is devoted to the provisions under which the State Department and the Soviet Union are to establish consulates and appoint consular personnel. The treaty does not in fact actually open any new consulates, but if ratified by the Senate, it gives the State Department a "blank check" to open an unlimited number of consulates with no further consultation of the Senate.

8. *Argument:* Consulates could be opened whether or not the present Convention is ratified.

Counter-argument: The obvious reply to this argument is: Why then, the need for including consulates in this treaty? Obviously, there is something contained in this treaty that cannot otherwise be obtained. That "something" is certainly not the right of "notification and access" because this right is provided to an even greater degree by the provisions of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations signed on April 24, 1963 by the United States, and which has now been signed by a total of 52 nations. The Vienna Convention needs only one more ratification to become effective but has never been sent to the Senate by our State Department to be ratified.

Opponents of the treaty believe that the necessity for this treaty from the State Department point of view is simply the desire of the State Department to exempt Soviet Consular personnel from the laws of the United States, which could not be done without Senate ratification of a treaty.

9. *Argument:* The number of Soviet consular personnel would be limited to 12 or 15 per consulate and would not greatly increase the total number of Soviet personnel enjoying diplomatic immunity.

Counter-argument: First, there is no nu-

merical limitation contained in the treaty itself. Thus, what the State Department foresees as the number of personnel involved may well prove inaccurate in actual practice. Again, this treaty is a "blank check" to the State Department and once ratified, the Senate will have no further control over its implementation.

Further, there is the factor of the "most favored nation" clauses that exist in consular conventions currently in force with other nations, including some Communist nations. These clauses will go into effect if this treaty is ratified, entitling hundreds of consular personnel already here to full diplomatic immunity. In his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Rusk stated: "If all of them exercise that option, our estimate is that approximately 400 officers and employees could be involved."

10. *Argument:* We will be protected against the activities of Soviet personnel because of the power to "expel" Soviet consular officials.

Counter-argument: The power to send a Soviet official home if he commits a crime such as bribery, extortion, blackmail, kidnapping or murder, is hardly a protection.

11. *Argument:* We will gain just as much from "diplomatic immunity" as the Soviets.

Counter-argument: This argument assumes that our personnel in the Soviet Union will have identical purposes and functions with those of Soviet personnel in the United States. J. Edgar Hoover has testified that "involving the great bulk of their official personnel in intelligence activity in one way or another, the Soviets utilize to the fullest extent possible any and all official means . . . as transmission belts to carry additional intelligence personnel into this country."

If this is the purpose and function of our diplomatic personnel in the Soviet Union, then this treaty should be properly referred to as a "spy exchange program."

We should also consider the fact that while the Soviets will be given access to tens of thousands of refugees from Communism, many of whom have relatives behind the Iron Curtain, and who are subject to extortion and blackmail . . . there is no such body of refugees from the West inside the Soviet Union on whom our officials would practice extortion and blackmail. Hence, there will be no reciprocity on this point.

12. *Argument:* J. Edgar Hoover has agreed that the advantages which would accrue to the United States by entering into such a treaty outweigh any disadvantages.

Counter-argument: In a letter to Senator Karl Mundt of January 23, 1967 Hoover stated, "The FBI is not a policy-making agency and we do not express opinions. Since 1924, when I became its Director, the FBI has refrained from injecting itself into the area of legislation. The Consular Convention between the Soviet Union and the United States which is now before the United States Senate, is no exception to this long-standing rule."

13. *Argument:* In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, J. Edgar Hoover withdrew his opposition to the treaty.

Counter-argument: As is clear from the above quotation, J. Edgar Hoover never "opposed" the treaty in the first place. He merely reported the facts as he knew them before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

At that time he stated that "a cherished goal of the Soviet intelligence services was realized when the United States signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on June 1, 1964, providing for the reciprocal establishment of consulates in our respective countries. One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations."

In the letter to Senator Mundt referred to

above, Mr. Hoover stated, "You specifically inquired whether I had changed my views or whether any evidence has developed to make me change my mind about my testimony of March 4, 1965. The answer is an unequivocal no."

14. *Argument:* The FBI can cope with any increase espionage arising from the establishment of Soviet consulates.

Counter-argument: The FBI and the other counter-intelligence agencies have never been 100% effective in the control of espionage. The history of the Cold War is replete with examples of Soviet espionage activities that have succeeded in yielding some of our most important secrets to the U.S.S.R.

One of the most important of these cases was the theft of the secrets of the Atomic bomb, which gave the Soviet Union the weapon without which there could be no Cold War. The Oppenheimer Hearings of the Atomic Energy Commission revealed that the command post of the Berkeley-based spy ring that delivered the A-Bomb to the Soviets was located in the Consulate of the Soviet Union in San Francisco.

In addition, it should be noted that this Soviet Consulate was able to function as a spy-center without the special benefits of consular inviolability and immunity contained in this treaty.

In fact, considering the provisions of this treaty against any inspection of Soviet equipment and baggage brought into the United States, for shipment to consulates, it is obvious that there is no way, short of violating the treaty laws of the United States, for the FBI to detect the importation of anything, from narcotics to A-Bombs, so long as it is marked "Diplomatic Pouch." Furthermore, should a shipment of narcotics be detected, there is no way to prevent its delivery short of abrogating Article 18 (2) of the treaty.

15. *Argument:* Ratification of this treaty will lead to reduced tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Counter-argument: There are numerous ways in which the establishment of consulates in both countries could lead to an increase, rather than a decrease of tension between the two nations. Any serious incident involving a violation of our consular establishment or the immunity of our consular personnel, whether by accident or design, could lead to outraged demands by the American people that the treaty be nullified.

On the other hand, any act of a Soviet official, accidental or otherwise, which might inflame American public opinion could have the same result. In addition, acts of revenge or agitation by refugee groups in this country against Soviet consulates (such as the recent bombing of the Yugoslav consulates) could add to the "tensions" between our countries.

15. *Argument:* An important part of the whole exercise of diplomacy these days is to isolate the Vietnam war, to maintain as good relations as possible between the United States and the Soviet Union during a tense period.

Counter-argument: The "isolation" of the Vietnam war would seem to require of the Soviet bloc that they cease to supply the enemy there. Yet, Poland alone has ten cargo vessels carrying Soviet-bloc weapons to North Vietnam of a full-time basis, and Soviet leaders have proclaimed their full support of the Hanoi efforts to subjugate South Vietnam.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE TREATY

The principle arguments against the ratification of this treaty are:

1. *Argument:* 350,000 Americans per day are involuntarily risking arbitrary loss of blood, limb and life by Soviet weapons in Vietnam, in comparison to the 12 or 18 thousand per year who are voluntarily risking arbitrary arrest in the Soviet Union.

Beside this comparison, all other argu-

ments for and against this treaty pale in significance in the minds of the American people.

Counter-argument: This is all the more reason why we must "Build Bridges" to the Soviet Union at this time.

2. *Argument:* The Soviet Union cannot be trusted to adhere to any agreement, unless it offers them more than it offers the other party. It should be noted that this Soviet Consular Convention was signed for the Soviets by Andrei Gromyko, the same man who was accused by President Kennedy of deliberately lying to him about the missiles sent to Cuba in 1962.

Counter-argument: If the Soviets violate this treaty, it can be considered void, and in any case, can be canceled with six months notice.

3. *Argument:* One of the results of this treaty will be to increase trade with the enemy in Vietnam, by way of the Soviet Union.

Counter-argument: Those who make this objection apparently base it on the fact that the Convention states that consular officers of the two countries will be entitled "to further the development of commercial, economic, cultural and scientific relations . . . between the two countries." This is the kind of phrase which is found in all consular conventions and agreements which the United States has signed with other countries in the 20th Century. It does not mean that there will be any change in the nature of our trade with the Soviet Union in so-called strategic items.

4. *Argument:* It is clearly established that Soviet diplomatic officials are secret policemen or intelligence agents first, and diplomats second. Besides the Hoover testimony on this point, there is the statement of Oleg Penkovskiy, who was the second-ranking agent of the GRU itself, who said: "In a Soviet consulate, almost 100 per cent of the personnel are KGB, with one or two GRU officers included." (*Penkovskiy Papers*)

Counter-argument: This treaty offers advantages to us that are worth the risks of additional Soviet intelligence agents being stationed in the consulates.

5. *Argument:* Soviet KGB agents are not simply ordinary spies who gather information, they are also trained assassins, equipped with special weapons and poisons to make their victims appear to have died naturally, or by suicide. In addition, they have used their consular positions in the past to extort information from refugees, blackmail security risks and even to kidnap those whom they consider dangerous to them, such as the case of Oksana Kasenkina, and, perhaps, Povl Bang-Jensen.

Counter-argument: There have been no recent cases of this nature, and again, this treaty offers advantages to us that are worth the risks.

6. *Argument:* We have a moral obligation to all those who have sought and received asylum from Communism by coming to America, not to allow the establishment of privileged Communist sanctuaries here, from which they can be terrorized anew by their former enemies.

Counter-argument: When they come to this country, it is up to them to accept the rules and regulations of America and not spend their time agitating hate against the countries from which they came. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 31, 1967, p. 2011.)

7. *Argument:* The provisions for "diplomatic immunity" contained in this treaty are unique for a consular convention. We have such conventions with more than 30 other nations, and none of them provide immunity for felonies. Why should we provide something special for the Soviets?

Counter-argument: This point was not in our original draft because it is not a part of our general practice. But when the matter was raised by the Soviets we gave it close

examination. We felt that in view of the special circumstances of the character of the two societies that it would be advantageous to us to go ahead on this basis.

Mr. Chairman, I will close this statement with a reiteration of the argument against this treaty for which there is no satisfactory counter-argument.

The Soviet Union is supplying its ally in North Vietnam with the only weapon that can shoot down the aircraft being flown by American pilots who represent the cream of our air forces. These Soviet anti-aircraft missiles are maintained—probably even manned—by the Soviet "technicians" to whom the Soviet press has referred as "fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Vietnamese people."

It might be well for the Senate to give some consideration in the case of this treaty, to the remarks of your colleagues in the other House of Congress, where in recent weeks there have been expressions of grave concern on the general subject of our relations with the Soviet Union as well as the specific subject of this Consular Convention. One Congressman who represents a city where it is proposed to locate a Soviet consulate has expressed his fear that the reaction of his constituents who have lost dear ones to Soviet Russian terrorism might be so violent as to create a dangerous situation for the cause of international peace. Another, highly respected member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has declared the fact that this consular treaty is proposed while Soviet ammunition, fired from almost all types of Russian-made guns, is killing and maiming Americans in Vietnam.

And in closing, I refer you to the remark of a member of Congress who arose to inform the House just days ago that his own son, a Lieutenant in Vietnam, had just become the victim of a Soviet weapon. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives, as a cross-section of the American people, may be taken as a reliable gauge of the current attitude of the people toward the Soviet Union. There are arguments and answers to all the reasons for and against this treaty, except in the case of this argument. What answer can a Senator give to the bereaved parent or wife of an American who has been deprived of his right to life by the acts of the criminal government to whom this treaty seeks to build a "bridge"?

Thank you.

ENLIGHTENING EDITORIAL ON SALISBURY'S HANOI REPORTING

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently called the attention of the House to the disservice to his country which Mr. Harrison Salisbury had rendered through his so-called factual reporting of civilian bombing in Hanoi. At the time I brought this matter to the attention of the House, I referred to previous dispatches filed by Mr. Salisbury when he was a correspondent in Moscow for the highly respected New York Times. I directed your attention to the variance of the contents of his copy when filed in Russia and his subsequent articles after he had returned to the United States.

I also directed your attention to the statements made in his dispatch from Hanoi which did not indicate that his

figures were spoon-fed him by North Vietnam officials. He subsequently described his oversight as a journalistic error. I termed it a colossal error and very bad reporting by spewing the Communist line.

After I had brought this matter to the attention of the House, my attention was called to the editorial which had appeared in the Picayune Item, of Mississippi, on the same subject. Now, undoubtedly, many other comments have been made editorially on Mr. Salisbury's sloppy reporting which served the Communist Party line, but I doubt if there has been or can be written an editorial which demands more attention than this editorial to which I direct your attention.

This editorial from the Picayune Item is perhaps the most important observation to be made on the subject because of the identity of the author.

Charles Nutter is one of the best newspapermen I have ever known, and I have known many of them.

He is armed with impressive credentials to make his opinion of Harrison Salisbury most important and most acceptable.

My observations recently were based entirely on the documented background of Mr. Salisbury and the documentation of his most recent exploits. Mr. Nutter's observation is based on personal observation of other Times correspondents and their modus operandi in Communist-flavored atmospheres.

Mr. Nutter, when I first met him, was chief of the Associated Press bureau in New Orleans.

His assignments with the Associated Press included service in Russia when I am informed that Walter Duranty, a Times correspondent, openly boasted for some 20 years that he wrote to please the Communist government because he wanted to stay there and not be thrown out.

Mr. Nutter also served in Spain during the civil war when Herbert Matthews was openly boasting that he wanted the Communist government to win the war and wrote accordingly. In case it has slipped your memory, this is the same Matthews who went to Cuba in 1957 and glorified Fidel Castro to the point that the State Department began undermining the legitimate government, and Batista fled and Castro took over.

It becomes apparent that the practice of reporters of the New York Times in Communist countries or countries where the Communists are attempting to gain control is no novelty.

But Mr. Nutter's credentials as an outstanding newspaperman and reporter go beyond his service in the areas which I have mentioned. He was selected by the Associated Press to direct its South American activities before he was the choice of the famed International House in New Orleans to become its director.

There is no doubt that Mr. Nutter knows whereof he writes, and it is refreshing to know he has returned to the newspaper field and is using his talents to cry out, admittedly perhaps in a wilderness, against those actions which tend to undermine America and its traditional institutions.

I share the opinion with many that Harrison Salisbury's articles on Hanoi did more damage to the United States than sending 100,000 soldiers there could have done.

Here is the editorial, written almost immediately after the Salisbury articles, which I commend to your attention and study.

[From the Picayune (Miss.) Item]

A QUESTIONABLE NEWSPAPER STUNT

We doubt that the New York Times is going to pick up any honors for Harrison Salisbury's coverage from Hanoi in Vietnam where it appears he has been mousetrapped by the North Vietnam government and the Viet Cong, and finds himself and his paper peddling the propaganda of a government which is killing and injuring several hundred Americans weekly in war.

The paper and Salisbury are beginning to feel the backlash of this journalistic stunt whereby he was admitted alone of American newspapermen to Hanoi by that government, evidently because Ho Chi Minh felt he could depend on this great American paper to disseminate Communist propaganda. It now comes out that Salisbury is being briefed by Australian and British communists in Hanoi, and his dispatches reflect their line of anti-Americanism.

The Associated Press and scores of other American newspapers have tried for years to station correspondents in Hanoi to cover that side of the conflict. But they all have been turned down by the North Vietnamese, and still are not allowed to enter. The action therefore of admitting Salisbury, an assistant managing editor of the New York Times who had spent nearly twenty years in Moscow, is questionable.

The Communists there apparently felt that he could be depended upon to write the kind of news reports which they felt would help their cause and further divide the American people. And so far Salisbury has accommodated Hanoi by sending back dispatches critical of American bombing raids, and other dispatches of dubious truth.

Salisbury is a competent, highly honored newspaperman whose dispatches from the Soviet Union won him much acclaim, but never displeased the Soviets because they always closely followed the Soviet line as indeed dispatches to the New York Times from the Soviet Union have for the past forty years.

Every American correspondent in Russia in the last 50 years has spread the government line and its propaganda to a certain extent, because it is impossible always to ferret out the truth where news sources are closed and where there is heavy censorship. For example to this day no outsider has ever seen the Russian space bases or seen a space launching or recovery; correspondents have to accept the bulletins issued by the government, true or false.

Such coverage can be excused from non-belligerent nations which we are not fighting in a hot war. But this becomes unacceptable and inexcusable when it comes from a nation against which we have 350,000 men fighting and dying, and in which we are engaged in a bitter war to the death.

Salisbury's interviews with government leaders become sheer propaganda, and his reports about our bombings are hearsay on his part. He saw none such and saw no civilians killed. Indeed American pilots have been quick to challenge the accuracy of the propaganda fed him by briefing communist officers. They know far more about the situation than the correspondent, hand-picked for entry, and who arrived weeks or months after the bombings.

It is a tragedy that the highly respected Times is being used by the Hanoi Communists to mislead, misinform and divide the

American people. But that is what is happening. Hanoi's only mistake was that it failed to recognize what a valuable ally it might have had for its propaganda a year or two or three ago.

If Hanoi was honest in wanting the truth known it would open its doors to all legitimate American correspondents and would let them file news freely from Hanoi. But this would not serve the propaganda purpose because some correspondents would dig deeper than others and might expose the truth.

The New York Times still is held responsible in government and newspaper circles for its action in praising and promoting Fidel Castro and undermining Batista in Cuba to the point the rebel Communist was able to overthrow the legitimate Cuban government and turn that country over to the Communists. A member of the Times editorial board, still employed there, was responsible for this tragic event.

The best thing that could happen would be for this newspaper to stop its use by the communists to mislead the people in this country, quickly and effectively. Withdrawal of Salisbury until Vietnam admitted all legitimate correspondents would be the proper action but it will not be taken by this newspaper, whose purposes are as questionable in Hanoi as they were in Havana nearly a decade ago.

WEST VIRGINIA'S BOOMING OHIO VALLEY

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I had the honor to introduce Mr. C. C. Baldwin, Jr., vice president and general manager, Specialty Chemical Division, Stauffer Chemical Co., who was the principal speaker at the 22d annual dinner of the Point Pleasant-Mason County Chamber of Commerce. This excellent meeting was held in Point Pleasant, W. Va., and revealed the great progress and exciting future plans for economic development in this great and booming Ohio Valley of West Virginia.

Because Vice President Baldwin brings out some little-known facts concerning the contribution which Mason County and West Virginia are making to the economic development of the Nation, under unanimous consent I include this fine address with my remarks:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Hechler, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a personal pleasure for me to be invited to speak before you this evening. I want to thank Ken Hechler for that most complimentary introduction.

I have become aware that in past years, the meetings of your chamber of commerce have brought to Point Pleasant some extremely interesting speakers . . . men like a distinguished professor, Dr. Moffat, who spoke on presidents' wives, and an unusual celebrity, Colonel Chuck Yeager whose speech in 1966 almost made you feel as if you were aboard his soaring jet when it first broke the sound barrier.

Tonight I have no inside glimpses of White House families to expound upon nor am I likely to take you up into the deep blue on a flight into history. I do have a message, however, that is bound to interest you . . . primarily because it is about you and about Mason County, West Virginia.

MASON COUNTY'S CONTRIBUTION

I would wager that few of you really know the full story of what you and your county today contribute to our Nation and the world. Inasmuch as I have been in the chemical industry all of my adult life, I would naturally tend to, and will, focus upon that aspect of your local area's productivity. So in that vein, then, let me tell you some of the exciting facts that make Mason County's industrial role a most significant one. It has all been accomplished in just the past ten years.

Of the numerous chemical products manufactured today in your local area, many beneficially affect the daily lives of most everyone of you—probably without your realizing how. You, therefore, may be interested in some statistics and information which, by the way, may also prove useful to your local Chamber of Commerce in its promotional programs.

CAPACITY FOR POLYESTER RESINS

Today Mason County possesses about 1/12 of the total U. S. production capacity for polyester resins. Maybe this doesn't sound very large to you but actually out of the total national output, Mason County accounts for a healthy 75 million pounds of polyester resins which are locally produced by your neighbors, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company. Polyester resins have many uses. Goodyear's is used primarily in the manufacture of tire cord.

You have all heard of *dacron*. Dupont sells their polyester fiber under that trade name. Polyester resin is also used to produce most of the magnetic recording tapes in the United States. So this particular chemical product from Mason County finds its way into many areas of activity throughout our land and, for that matter, the world.

VINYL PLASTIC PRODUCTION

Let us take another product polyvinyl chloride—one of the largest volume plastics produced today in the United States—and more commonly known to most of you as "vinyl plastic." It is used for so many things, such as, for example, the shower curtains in your bathroom, the upholstery covering in your car, the protective cover for your outdoor furniture, plastic pipe for drainage ditches, insulation on electrical wiring, the vinyl floor tile in your kitchen. Mason County proudly includes among its major industries the Pantasote Company. Its new plant produces a generous 4% of the total U.S. output of polyvinyl chloride resins. This share is a significant one since, out of total U.S. productive capacity, Mason County alone accounts for over 100 million pounds. I would not be loyal to Stauffer if, at this point, I did not mention that we also are an important producer of polyvinyl chloride resins—with plants in California, and Delaware.

Included in the major product groups produced by Stauffer chemical at its plant here are *phosphate esters*. Our continuous production unit for phosphate esters is the largest of its kind in the world. Stauffer's combined production for all phosphate esters represents 30% of the U.S. capacity for this type of product.

Phosphate esters have a wide variety of uses and applications. Although you may not realize it, you all come in contact with them regularly.

GASOLINE ADDITIVE

The gasoline you buy may contain an additive called TCP (tricresyl phosphate) which was first made famous worldwide by Shell Oil. Other oil companies, under license from Shell, also use TCP in their gasoline. Stauffer's Mason County plant is one of the major producers of this gasoline additive.

Another important use for phosphate esters is to make a wide variety of products fire resistant. Examples would include fireproofing such things as the plastic foam cushions

used in your home, mattresses in hospitals and hotels, the seats of automobiles, vinyl drapes for schools and public buildings.

Phosphate esters are also used as hydraulic fluids in steel mills, power plants, and chemical plants throughout the world where there is a need to protect against fire in case of a hydraulic system leak.

In addition, phosphate esters are used as transmission oil additives to prevent system leakage in cars and trucks.

HALF OF JET LUBRICANT PRODUCTION IN MASON COUNTY

Now I want to tell you of another new chemical that is Mason County produced. Your local Stauffer chemical plant turns out a new synthetic lubricant which now supplies 50% of the U.S. Air Force and Navy's requirements for synthetic jet engine lubricants in use throughout the world. Many of our NATO allies also purchase this synthetic lubricant from Stauffer for their jet air force needs.

Very soon Stauffer will be supplying several commercial air lines—flying in the United States and abroad—with synthetic jet engine lubricants—all to be produced here in Mason County. Our first important airline customer was one you are familiar with—Piedmont Airlines. All of their jet turbine powered aircraft now use a synthetic jet engine lubricant made right here in Mason County.

OTHER STAUFFER PRODUCTS

A number of other products produced by Stauffer Chemical here in Mason County are not made anywhere else in the world. One is a special additive which helps to improve the resistance of nylon carpets to heat and light.

I've tossed a lot of facts and figures at you in a pretty big hurry here. What I'm trying to say in summary is that your county has become an important center in the vast chemical complex that extends along the Ohio and Kanawha River Valleys. Mason County is definitely a major factor in the production of polyester resins, polyvinyl chloride plastics, gasoline additives, fire resistant plasticizers, fire retardants for plastic foam, synthetic fire resistant hydraulic fluids, and jet engine lubricants.

A large share of the credit for the development and growth of Mason County's chemical industry must go to you, the local members of the chamber of commerce. You have done an excellent job in presenting your story. I am sure that your area leaders have also aided this cause, such as Congressman Hechler.

WHY INDUSTRY LOCATES IN MASON COUNTY

There are several good reasons why industry should be interested in locating or expanding in Mason County. You have a lot of things going for you. Some of them are God-given: such as the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers, providing inexpensive transportation and an abundance of water, which is so vitally important to most chemical operations. And there is land available—lots of it.

You also have dependable rail service to other areas of the country. West Virginia's highway system is good, and hopefully will be improved upon substantially with such projects as the proposed new highway between here and Huntington.

Mason County also has readily available the three major sources of energy (coal, natural gas, and electricity), which are basic needs of chemical industries. In abundant supply, these are also available at the right price.

IMPORTANCE OF THE AIRPORT

Recently, I was pleased to hear about another important asset you are adding to Mason County—the new airport to be constructed this year. I can't impress upon you how important this airport will be to strengthen the future development of Mason County as an industrial center.

Today, Stauffer Chemical and most other companies, when examining new plant sites, consider nearby airport facilities as one of the important factors. In today's world and at the pace we keep, time is critical. Measured in hours and minutes, rather than days, it is important to be able to move engineers, chemists, marketing people, production people, customers, and management people back and forth as quickly as possible. Therefore, modern timesaving airport facilities are important if one is to run an efficient and profitable business. Your new airport will play a vital role in developing further the economy of Mason County.

Probably the most important factor today in selecting a new plant site is people. Industry needs to have readily available increased numbers of intelligent, trained people who want to work. We may have a population "explosion" problem in today's world, but in the United States our need for competent employees is a constant one, with the high rate of employment we have today throughout the Nation.

The people of Mason County, therefore, are really your major asset. We and our industrial neighbors here are going to need you.

HOW TO ATTRACT MORE INDUSTRY

Some words of counsel on what your organization should do to attract qualified people to work and live in Mason County.

First, improve your schools. Second, expand your homebuilding programs. Also, continue improving and modernizing your fine stores which I have seen in downtown Point Pleasant. This will help make your area a more attractive place to live. We at Stauffer Chemical are doing our part to recruit scientists and engineers to come here for interviews from all over the U.S.A. We can and will cooperate with the chamber of commerce to convince these skilled personnel that Mason County is a great place to work and live.

Confidence and faith in Mason County have already been strongly demonstrated by our neighbors—Goodyear and Pantasote with their recent investments of substantial sums of money to expand their plants here.

MILLION DOLLAR EXPANSION PROGRAM

I am pleased to tell you tonight that Stauffer feels the same way. Our company is planning to spend over a million dollars during 1967 to construct new facilities and expand existing installations at our Point Pleasant plant. Furthermore, we are developing plans for even larger projects to be considered for future years.

You all know that well-known expression, "a picture is worth ten-thousand words". I don't think I have used ten-thousand words tonight. Also we haven't used any picture slides or visual aids. However, I did bring along some 3-dimensional evidence which should symbolize my message that the chemicals and plastics produced here come back to you in the form of familiar products.

As you leave our dinner meeting tonight, I would like to invite you to take a souvenir. A souvenir that is symbolic of Mason County's industrial strength. For the men, please accept a courtesy can of Firestone transmission fluid for your auto. This product is made from the phosphate ester which Stauffer Chemical makes right here in Point Pleasant, West Virginia. There are actually about 25 or 26 different brands on the market, but all are similarly based on phosphate esters produced by Stauffer here in West Virginia. We ship out tank car supplies to many manufacturers who then package the product in cans, shipping it out through distribution channels to local gasoline stations, service centers, and auto stores.

For the ladies, we have available some plastic table cloths made of vinyl plastic. The raw material for this product is PVC resin produced by Pantasote here at Point Pleasant,

West Virginia. For safety, the table cloth also contains a fire-resistant plasticizer produced by Stauffer Chemical at Point Pleasant. Pantasote and Stauffer's products are shipped from here to fabricating plants in other parts of the country. There they are combined with dyes and fillers. Processed and calandered as sheets, printed, stitched—the finished product eventually finds its way right back to Mason County for your shopping selection.

I certainly enjoyed talking to you. I hope I have been able to broaden your knowledge and realization of what you, yourselves, contribute to the world in the form of chemicals and plastics produced in Mason County.

RELEASE OF FUNDS BY THE ADMINISTRATION THAT WERE RECENTLY CUT FROM THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see in this morning's paper that the administration plans to release today a large part of the funds that were cut from the Federal highway construction program recently.

The point had already been made in the House that there were no legal grounds for the cutback. I previously pointed out that it had violated congressional intent as well.

Checking over the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the Highway Act of 1956, setting up the highway trust fund, was passed, I find that this congressional intent as far as the use of money going into the trust fund was concerned was spelled out quite clearly indeed.

I wrote the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last week, citing two of the most significant remarks made in 1956. By law and congressional intent, this money belongs to the States, and any other use of it, or any withholding of it, is tantamount to misappropriation of Government funds.

The text of the letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1967.
Hon. CHARLES L. SCHULTZ,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: The recent cutback in highway construction funds not only has no basis in written statute, but in addition it violates long-standing and near-unanimous Congressional intent. Careful reading of the 1956 debate, when the highway trust fund was established, shows plainly that the will and desire of the Congress was to guarantee this construction money to the States without interruption.

HR 10660, which became PL 84-627, the Highway Act of 1956, passed the House by a vote of 399 to 19, in itself evidence of the overwhelming support for the concepts of this legislation. The following statements made at the time by members of both parties are indicative of a sentiment which has not changed:

Mr. Reid of New York, then ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways

and Means: "... it is important to emphasize that the bill provides for the establishment of a highway trust fund. ... The existence of this fund will insure that these receipts will not be diverted to other purposes."

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana, now second-ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means as well as House Majority Whip: "... This bill ... establishes the highway trust fund which dedicates most of these funds to highway construction and for that purpose only. ... Thus, for the first time, the American motorist will pay these taxes with the assurance that he will be the direct beneficiary of every penny which he pays and he will pay with the knowledge that every cent derived from these taxes will be devoted exclusively to his personal convenience and safety."

The Administration has forced the States to beg for money that is rightfully theirs by law and Congressional intent. This is legally and morally wrong. It savors of misappropriation of Government funds, an action that cannot be condoned and must be stopped. I urge the cutback order be revoked and the funds be made available to the States, as the law provides, and as the Congress desires.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Member of Congress.

A KNOCK ON THE DOOR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Northumberland Echo of Heathsville, Va., had a recent editorial, entitled "A Knock on the Door," relating to an investigation of the Northumberland County public school system by the FBI at the request of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

According to the editorial, without disclosing their purpose two agents spent 3 days carefully going over school records for the past several years. Supposedly they were investigating a complaint made against the school system by a local citizen.

There seems to be something inherently wrong about a Federal agency going into a county and reviewing records without advising local officials as to the reason.

I wish to bring this to the attention of the House, in the hope that it is an isolated case, and will not happen again in Heathsville or elsewhere.

I have written the Acting Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, for a report on the situation.

A KNOCK ON THE DOOR

And it did happen here. Two FBI agents spent three days recently carefully going over every phrase of the school system in Northumberland County. What were their credentials? A request from the Department of Justice signed by John Doar, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, that the investigation be made. Why was it issued? Because of a complaint of a violation under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made by a local school patron.

The FBI men, evidently in the dark along with the school board office as to the discrimination involved, settled down to a metic-

ulous study of school records for the past several years. These men were experts, not a stone was left unturned. But what was the charge? Who made it? Superintendent Brann and the school board do not know.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 under Article 17, Violations to be Reported, includes the following: "Anyone with a complaint to report should first bring it to the attention of the State or local school officials, unless he feels it would not be helpful to do so." That the complainant did not do this would indicate that the violation was a serious one.

So let's get down to brass tacks. If this complaint was grave enough to merit two highly trained men spending three whole days investigating Northumberland's school system, then the citizens of the county have the right to know the reason that prompted its being made—to see that the situation is rectified.

But if the complaint was trivial, one that could have been easily settled by a conference with school officials, then we hold that the Office of Education is culpable of furthering tale-bearing.

Last November at a Virginia Teachers Association conference in Richmond, H. N. Taylor, a teacher at Fairfield's Elementary School, complained that Negroes in this county are "not satisfied with things as they are going" in public school desegregation. He said, "We feel there is a need for more pressure on them." We take it by "them" Mr. Taylor also included his own race.

The Civil Rights Act discourages members of the school board from interrogating Mr. Taylor about his dissatisfaction with the status quo. At the same time it seems to condone a system of irresponsible accusation which could become vicious if allowed full rein.

In spite of the sixth amendment of our Constitution taking a dim view of withholding the "nature and cause of the accusation" could this nation ever become another Hungary where a knock on the door may have ominous significance?

GEORGIA STATE SENATE REPEAL OF RESOLUTION 21 RELATIVE TO THE ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1967, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] read into the RECORD the text of the Georgia State Senate Resolution 21 passed on February 13, 1967, by the Georgia State Senate, but apparently was unaware the Georgia State Senate revoked and repealed this resolution February 17, 1967, making the resolution null and void.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert Georgia State Senate Resolution 40 into the RECORD which revokes Resolution 21 mentioned before.

As a further word, Mr. Speaker, in the Georgia State Senate there is a procedure for passing what are called privileged resolutions. These resolutions require no committee action, do not have the three readings of other resolutions

and bills, and most often are the work of only one senator. By custom in the Georgia State Senate the privileged resolution is used for the purpose of commending individuals and organizations. It is not to be used for stating the position of the Georgia State Senate without full debate.

I have received in the past few days numerous letters from my former colleagues in the Georgia State Senate who have stated due to the nature of Resolution 21, they were unaware of its passage and when it became known to them that the resolution stated the position of the Georgia State Senate on a matter of great substance, it was revoked, rescinded, and repealed by Resolution 40.

As additional comment, a number of Georgia senators advised me that to the best of their knowledge Resolution 21 had the support of only one senator:

GEORGIA STATE SENATE RESOLUTION

A resolution relative to Senate Resolution 21; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the Senate, That Senate Resolution No. 21, relative to the Atlantic Union Delegation, is hereby repealed and rescinded.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to furnish appropriate copies of this Resolution to the United States Senators and the members of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Georgia. Senate Resolution No. 40.

By Senators Gardner of the 1st, Bateman of the 27th and Adams of the 26th.

Adopted in Senate February 17, 1967.

GEO. L. SMITH,

President of the Senate.

HAMILTON McWHORTER, Jr.,

Secretary of the Senate.

THE SEATTLE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty in Seattle—as in most cities—has suffered rude jolts in recent weeks as the result of cutbacks necessitated under last year's antipoverty legislation. Seattle's outstanding program has been forced to sustain cutbacks totaling \$1 million in highly effective, locally developed projects which have brought hope and opportunity to the poor of Seattle and King County.

Mr. Speaker, a forceful and informative article by Lane Smith, entitled "Poor Persons Give Eloquent Praise to Poverty Programs," appeared in the Seattle Times on January 13. Mr. Smith describes a public meeting called by Mayor Braman to discuss the cuts in the community action programs of the Seattle-King County OEO. As Mr. Smith tells it:

The poor spoke eloquently and movingly today about their participation in the war on poverty.

Mrs. Dora Miller, a poverty neighborhood resident employed as a "day-care mother" by the Neighborhood House

Service Center, described what being involved in the war on poverty means to her:

I can be independent. It means I have my own income. Before, I was on welfare and I even thought my children belonged to the State.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Miller speaks for thousands of disadvantaged citizens in Seattle and King County. With our support, they will be able to continue winning their own wars on poverty. I am extremely grateful to Lane Smith for his fine article, and with permission include it at this point in the RECORD:

POOR PERSONS GIVE ELOQUENT PRAISE TO POVERTY PROGRAM (By Lane Smith)

The poor spoke eloquently and movingly today about their participation in the war on poverty.

They made much stronger impressions than men long skilled in public speaking at a meeting called by Mayor Braman to build up community pressure against federal fund cutbacks in community-action programs of the Seattle-King County Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mrs. Dora Miller, a "day-care mother" employed by the Neighborhood House Service Centers, said employment given her under the war on poverty program means:

"I can be independent. It means I have my own income. Before, I was on welfare and I even thought my children belonged to the state."

Neighborhood House, under a federal grant, employs mothers such as Mrs. Miller as day-care mothers for the children of other working mothers.

Another day-care mother, Mrs. Ozeal Wrice, a resident of the Rainier Vista Housing project, said:

"It bothered me to be on welfare. My children seemed to be ashamed of it."

"Even if the cuts means that I won't be able to work as a day-care mother, I am licensed and I will be able to take care of myself. I won't have to go back on welfare. It feels good."

Both professional staff members and persons employed in or aided by poverty programs confirmed what the projected \$1 million in fund cutbacks will mean to local community programs.

Renton Mayor Donald Custer, outgoing chairman of the Seattle-King County O.E.O. board, said community-action programs have made a highly successful start, "but not much more."

Braman urged a "community expression of support for retention" of the federal grants. He said:

"Many community-action programs have not been given time to prove their worth, but they have lasted long enough to inspire hope and purpose, which should not be crushed."

"To reduce or possibly eliminate federal support could be devastating, to the extent that the poor sink back into hopelessness, on the one hand, or surge into seething anger on the other—having been built up only to be let down."

Presentations were made by Caritas, a program specializing in volunteer tutoring by university and college students; the Central Area Motivation Program, the largest community poverty program, which faces severe cuts in its study-center programs; the Council on Aging's extended-services project; the Justice Court probation program, The Travelers Aid Newcomer Program, and the new Careers Program, which has not been funded.

Representatives of the Head Start program, which would not be affected by local cutbacks, and the Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center, a training program

also apparently unaffected, made strong pleas for the community-action projects.

Custer explained that the national poverty programs are not affected by the local cut-backs. He said many of these programs whose funds are dictated by the federal government are receiving more money than they ask.

Walter Hubbard, executive director of CARITAS, said the free tutoring contributed by students amounts to a donation of about \$100,000. Several parents whose children are tutored at St. Peter Claver Center by CARITAS volunteers told how their children's grades had benefited.

Mrs. Eva Lee, mother of five, said the CAMP program had provided baby-sitting and housekeeping services while she was confined to bed after delivery of twins last year.

"I often pray that we can keep this program," Mrs. Lee said.

The Rev. Mineo Katagiri, new chairman of the local O.E.O. board, said the office had been directed to hire a staff member to seek money from private organizations.

IS THE YUGOSLAVIA COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR VIETNAM A CONDUIT FOR YUGOSLAV GOVERNMENT AID TO NORTH VIETNAM?

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President should have the Central Intelligence Agency determine whether the Yugoslavia Coordinating Committee for Vietnam is actually a conduit through which the Yugoslav Government aids North Vietnam.

I made the proposal in the following letter I sent yesterday to the White House:

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Despite the intended effect of the Findley Amendment to last year's Appropriation Act for Agriculture, as interpreted by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Departments of State and Agriculture are in the process of completing a transaction under Public Law 480, in which Yugoslavia will get subsidized credit worth about \$2 million in connection with the purchase of about \$9 million in vegetable oil.

The decision to go ahead apparently was based on a memorandum supplied to the Department of State by the Department of Justice on November 18, 1966 which held that the Findley Amendment—aimed at shutting off aid to nations that make shipments to North Vietnam—applied only to government shipments, not those of a private character.

At issue were shipments of medical supplies, which according to the memorandum were sponsored by organizations in Yugoslavia which were allegedly non-governmental and privately financed. Those named were: The Socialist Alliance, The Trade Union Federation, The Association of Veterans Federations, The Youth Federation, The Yugoslavian Red Cross, The Student Union, The Conference of Social Activities for Women, and the Yugoslavian League for Peace and Independence and Equality of Peoples.

In reaching the conclusion that the vegetable

oil shipment should not be made, pending legislative clarification, the Comptroller General in his opinion to the Secretary of Agriculture dated February 2, 1967 came to the view that the proviso applied to private as well as government shipments. Although I agree with the Comptroller General's view, it appears that the Executive Branch has decided on a contrary opinion.

That being the case, would it not be wise to determine the true character of the so-called private organizations in Yugoslavia?

In recent days the American people, myself included, have learned with astonishment that many prominent U.S. organizations believed to be unconnected with the government have actually been secretly subsidized for years by the Central Intelligence Agency. These have included labor union, student organizations and foundations of various sorts.

If this can happen in what we proudly acclaim as our open society, it occurs to me that the conclusions apparently reached by the State Department as to the strictly private character of the Yugoslav organizations may also be questioned.

Therefore I request that the deal with Yugoslavia be halted until our government has explored the very real possibility that the organizations enumerated in the third paragraph of this letter have close links with the Tito regime, perhaps even including financial aid.

The agency that logically comes to mind to undertake this fact finding chore is the Central Intelligence Agency. It has international contacts and certainly has a staff well experienced in techniques employed to keep secret government payments to private organizations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

STATE DEPARTMENT CLARIFICATION OF LITVINOFF MEMORANDUM

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1967, I wrote the Secretary of State asking for a clarification of the Litvinoff memorandum of November 16, 1933. This memorandum dealt with the question of detention of American nationals while in the Soviet Union and consular access to them. In my letter I requested information whether the memorandum was still in effect today.

I have received a reply from the Department of State and ask that the full text of the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The text of the letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 13, 1967.
HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: The Secretary has asked me to respond to your letter of February 2, 1967, in which you comment favorably on the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union now pending before the Senate and ask for clarification on certain points relating to the declaration made to

President Roosevelt by Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinoff on November 16, 1933. For convenience of reference I am enclosing the full text of the Litvinoff letter.

As you indicate in your letter, a prime purpose of the pending Convention is to obtain assured rights of consular notification and access in the case of Americans arrested in the Soviet Union. The Litvinoff declaration, while addressed to the same subject, proved to be wholly inadequate to assure these rights. Its legal deficiencies were among the reasons that persuaded the Department to negotiate and sign the pending Consular Convention, containing as it does clear and unequivocal provisions on the point.

Mr. Litvinoff's letter to President Roosevelt declared that American nationals would receive rights of consular protection no less favorable than those enjoyed by nationals of the nation most favored in this respect. The letter also referred to a Soviet-German Agreement of 1925, which provided for notification within three to seven days and for access "without delay", as the then-current standard of most-favored-nation treatment. This Soviet-German Agreement, however, did not survive World War II; and up until the signing of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Convention in 1964, the Soviet Union did not conclude any other treaties with specific provisions for consular notification or access. At the time of Professor Barghoorn's arrest in 1963, accordingly, there were no treaties in force between the Soviet Union and other countries from whose provisions the United States could claim the most-favored-nation treatment pledged by Mr. Litvinoff.

Even while the Soviet-German Agreement of 1925 was in force, its application was in practice entirely unsatisfactory to the United States. Several cases occurred in which American citizens were arrested and no consular notification or access was given until long after the arrest. In these cases we protested strenuously to the Soviet Union, asserting that under the Soviet-German Agreement notification was due within three to seven days, and that we were entitled to access "without delay", after the arrest. The Soviets took the position, however, that notification and access rights did not become operative until after the investigation. This was in fact the interpretation they were following in the case of German nationals. Thus although the United States was receiving most-favored-nation treatment, that treatment was wholly inadequate from our viewpoint.

The issues of notification and access are unmistakably resolved in the 1964 Consular Convention and its Protocol, which make clear that notification and access must be accorded within four days "from the time of arrest or detention." As you note in your letter, the Secretary has testified that the U.S.S.R. has never before given so specific a guarantee on access.

Ratification of the Consular Convention would bring into force the legal instrument contemplated by the Litvinoff letter as the definitive means for assuring consular protection to American nationals in the Soviet Union. Such rights, Mr. Litvinoff stated, were to be included in a consular convention "to be negotiated immediately following the establishment of relations." No consular convention was concluded, however, until the two countries signed the 1964 Convention now pending before the Senate. We agree with you that its provisions, particularly those dealing with consular notification and access, are very much in our national interest.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Enclosure: Litvinoff letter of November 16, 1933.

WASHINGTON,
November 16, 1933.

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following our conversations I have the honor to inform you that the Soviet Government is prepared to include in a consular convention to be negotiated immediately following the establishment of relations between our two countries provisions in which nationals of the United States shall be granted rights with reference to legal protection which shall not be less favorable than those enjoyed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by nationals of the nation most favored in this respect. Furthermore, I desire to state that such rights will be granted to American nationals immediately upon the establishment of relations between our two countries.

In this connection I have the honor to call to your attention Article 11 and the Protocol to Article 11, of the Agreement Concerning Conditions of Residence and Business and Legal Protection in General concluded between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on October 12, 1925.

"ARTICLE 11.

"Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes to adopt the necessary measures to inform the consul of the other Party as soon as possible whenever a national of the country which he represents is arrested in his district. "The same procedure shall apply if a prisoner is transferred from one place of detention to another.

"FINAL PROTOCOL

"Ad Article 11

"1. The Consul shall be notified either by a communication from the person arrested or by the authorities themselves direct. Such communications shall be made within a period not exceeding seven times twenty-four hours, and in large towns, including capitals of districts, within a period not exceeding three times twenty-four hours.

"2. In places of detention of all kinds, requests made by consular representatives to visit nationals of their country under arrest, or to have them visited by their representatives, shall be granted without delay. The consular representative shall not be entitled to require officials of the courts or prisons to withdraw during his interview with the person under arrest."

I am, my dear Mr. President,
Very sincerely yours,

MAXIM LITVINOFF,

People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

REPRESENTATIVE FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR VIETNAM

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging aspects of the struggle in Vietnam is the movement toward a representative and democratic government for the Republic of Vietnam. We have learned through bitter experience that a government which is strongly anti-Communist without itself being representative is hardly an adequate deterrent to Communist subversion.

The strongest defense against Communist subversion is a constitutionally

based government which offers political opportunities for all its people.

The progress of South Vietnam toward constitutional government has not always been as certain or as determined as it now is. The most dramatic evidence of the growth of democracy was the recent constituent assembly election. This election, held in a country during a state of war, resulted in 80.8 percent of the registered voters casting their ballots for 532 candidates competing for 117 seats in the Constituent Assembly. This election was in itself dramatic refutation to the claim of the National Liberation Front that it represents a majority of the Vietnamese, because an estimated 56 percent of all Vietnamese of voting age cast ballots at the risk of Vietcong reprisal, demonstrating their determination to develop their own independent political institutions. Despite the large-scale attempts at intimidation, three-fourths of the voting-age population were registered to vote, and four out of every five of those registered voted. This success destroys the NLF's claim that they control two-thirds of the population and are the "sole genuine representatives" of the Vietnamese people.

The attempts of the Vietnamese to build their own political system must necessarily start with a constitution. I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which expresses the full support of Congress for the efforts of the Constituent Assembly now in session to provide for the right of self-determination through a representative form of government for the state of Vietnam.

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly has been formed as a result of recent elections; and

Whereas this Constituent Assembly is preparing a new constitution to provide a basis of freedom for the people of South Vietnam; and

Whereas this Constituent Assembly proposes that all people of the Republic of South Vietnam be permitted to vote for the officials who will govern them; and

Whereas the United States, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, is dedicated to the principle that people everywhere have the right to determine their own destiny through free participation in the choosing of their government; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its full support of the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly in its efforts to assure all the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination and the right to choose a representative form of government.

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL ON CIA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House, including myself, have expressed alarm with the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in assisting financially the activities of var-

ious "nongovernmental" organizations including the National Student Association.

The Washington Post on Tuesday, February 21, 1967, had an excellent editorial discussing this subject and pointing out the dangers in this type of activity. Too often we in this country tend to forget that a policy of anticommunism is not enough. Our purpose must be to advance democracy and freedom. Merely containing communism does not mean we have succeeded in establishing democratic governments and preserving freedom. Certainly these two principles cannot exist where there is communism, but neither does the absence of communism guarantee their presence. We must guard carefully against using state tactics to defeat a police state. In defending ourselves and others against our enemies we must be vigilant lest we be swept into adopting the very strategy and tactical devices of our opponents.

The editorial follows:

PREVENTING SUBVERSION

The first object of the President's task force on the Central Intelligence Agency's operations ought to be to devise a system that will make the country's non-governmental professional associations secure against secret, covert and conspiratorial subversion by the Government.

Its first purpose ought to be the preservation of the integrity and independence of the private institutions and agencies whose separate existence distinguishes a free from a totalitarian society. No doubt some of these associations, as the result of CIA financing, have, in the past, made a contribution toward the conduct of American policy abroad. But it is a contribution that they cannot make without diminishing, if not destroying, their larger role in the formation of opinion and the ventilation of criticism of government here at home. For government, in a free society, is not a thing apart from the society it serves—it is a product of society. And its views emerge from the clash of opinion and the storm of controversy. To tamper with the spontaneity of that clash and controversy is to pollute the mainsprings of policy at the source. The various professions, crafts, trades and academic institutions alone can perform this function. Other agencies can be used, by other means, to further national interests at stake in direct competition with our cold war opponents.

The competition for the control of various international professional groups is a political struggle common to our time. Perhaps we cannot escape it. Our opponents in this struggle have no existence, no policy, no purpose other than that of their governments. They come to this battlefield better financed, better indoctrinated, better coordinated than do our representatives. And so, in the short run, they may win some contests that we would not wish to lose. But few of these battles are of such serious consequence that we can afford to win them by means that imperil the very freedoms we struggle to preserve. And where they are of that importance, and no other alternative is available, open, avowed, admitted and on-the-record governmental support surely would be the best way to accomplish our purposes. It is, in any case, the way that does not hazard the survival of our domestic society in order to win a point in the struggle for the control of international groups.

The full dimensions of the CIA operation are not yet known. What is known indicates that the CIA has been used to channel Federal funds into private groups for the good purpose of contending for the control of

many international bodies. That has had a catastrophic effect on the creditability of some of these groups. But so far, no one has suggested a worse misuse of Federal funds than such secrecy might make possible in the future. This power and authority raises a specter of corruption that has alarmed every free people since the Walpole government in Great Britain used its secret funds to corrupt the Parliament itself. It is not alleged that this has happened here—but the almost unrestricted discretion of the CIA to spend what and where it will could be perverted. It ought to appall Americans to know that an agency of their Government (for a good purpose) has prejudiced the independence of private groups important in their intellectual life. Unless appropriate steps are taken, it may appall them even more, at some future time, to discover that such an agency has prejudiced the integrity of private organizations for a bad purpose. Some of the groups already involved have great power in this country. Their favor or opposition, in some cases, is sufficient to determine the death or survival of associated institutions. They could be as useful in fixing the fate of political parties or factions inside the country as they have been useful abroad. And unless the misuse of this kind of concealed subsidy, secret conspiracy and financial corruption is made impossible, this is the kind of rot that will some day appear in this Nation. Now is the time to prevent it by unequivocal, explicit and unmistakable provisions in the law itself that will put these operations under more stringent and more intensive and more continuous review, fixing the responsibility so clearly that no future Congress, no future Administration and no future supervisory board can say that they did not know what was going on.

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, I sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce regarding the reestablishment of the weather station at Burlington, Iowa. I include the letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1967.
Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Having learned of the tornado which tragically took one person's life and caused injury to many others in Fort Madison, Iowa, I feel it necessary to urge the re-establishment of the weather bureau at Burlington, Iowa. The death, injury, and damage resulting from the tornado could have been prevented if the Burlington weather station had been in operation and, therefore, able to warn citizens of the storm's approach.

Although I represent the 20th District of Illinois, this Iowa weather station was important to my District as it provided weather information, forecasts, and storm warnings for eight west-central Illinois counties. Located as we are, jutting into northeastern Missouri, the weather forecast for western Illinois has often passed us before we've heard about it. We need the pinpointing

attention we formerly enjoyed from the Burlington weather bureau for the safety of those threatened by storm and flood, for its value to industry and business, and for personal convenience and general satisfaction.

This part of the Mississippi Valley can generate sudden and erratic switches in the weather that seem independent of the major systems dominating the national picture. This particular area, therefore, needs a special watch. It was promised that the area would be served from Des Moines but last week's tornado demonstrated the inadequacy of that arrangement.

I, therefore, request that you take whatever action may be necessary to re-establish the weather station at Burlington, Iowa. Among the many reasons are:

1. The large area served has been left relatively unprotected.
2. The fact that the station was here, and facilities are still available at the Burlington airport, make it more economical to reactivate the service here, rather than instituting a substitute elsewhere.
3. The forecast record of its 23 years here was one of the best in the country.
4. Forecasting of river stages makes the Burlington site ideal for the area.
5. The IAAP, a major reason for moving the station here in 1941, is operating now at the highest level since World War II.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

PERIL OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist and dean of war correspondents, Edgar Ansel Mower, recently accorded richly deserved praise to Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, and at the same time ably summarized the case against the nuclear weapon treaty in the following column:

DISARMAMENT WOULD FREE REDS TO EXPAND FURTHER

(By Edgar Ansel Mower)

Which is more important to you: uninspected disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union leading to "general and total disarmament" (maybe) or a halt to further communist expansion?

As an American and a voter you should make up your mind quickly for the chances are you cannot have both.

Uninspection disarmament agreements with Moscow, such as those now accepted or desired by the U.S. administration, can save money for antipoverty efforts, more social security, more subsidies apparently required by the Great Society. Yet, contrary to what government spokesmen are saying, they will not diminish the danger of major nuclear war.

In fact, according to Congressman Craig Hosmer, ranking Republican Representative on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, they are largely a hoax. Hosmer knows war first-hand having had active naval service from 1940 to 1946 (unlike so many of our young disarmers who have never heard a shot fired in anger). Moreover, he spent a year in Los Alamos with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Halting further Soviet expansion will cost money—more and more of it, in all likeli-

hood. For we cannot afford to allow the Soviet Union and Red China, separate or together, to surpass us in any vital weapon, as the former has already done in large nuclear warheads and threatens to do with anti-missile missiles.

RACE COSTLY TO REDS

The resulting armament race makes nuclear war so horrendous as to be unlikely. And because of the vastly superior wealth of the United States, the race puts a greater strain on the U.S.S.R. Yet while that country has already surrounded Moscow with anti-missile missiles, the United States has so far done nothing of the kind.

The greater the degree of disarmament reached by both countries, the more the Soviet Union and lesser Red countries will be free to spread the Red blight by all means short of nuclear war, from unlimited propaganda and systematic subversion to more "little wars of liberation," as in Viet Nam.

The American champions of relaxing tensions know this as well as the partisans of military preponderance over the Soviet Union. But the former believe that the danger of the armament race is greater than that of "trusting the Russians."

Therefore after saying for years that it would not, the Administration now seeks, according to Congressman Hosmer, "not only a disarmament treaty . . . but a nonproliferation treaty, a treaty to halt production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons, a treaty to stop us from building nuclear delivery systems including anti-missile defenses, a treaty to remove fissionable material from existing warheads." In addition it is asking the Senate to ratify the Treaty on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space now—with no built-in possibility of inspection to prevent the Soviet Union "from orbiting nuclear monsters."

PEACE AT A PRICE

The nonproliferation treaty, which is still waiting for Soviet acceptance, would not, according to Hosmer, make for peace. But it would have another and, to my mind, disastrous result. It would divide the world permanently into two nuclear giants, several nuclear pigmies and a mass of totally impotent countries. Acting together, the United States and the Soviet Union could impose anything they wanted upon the rest of the world, including our real friends at least, until the world accepted "general and total disarmament."

Any such dyarchy would be particularly intolerable to one-time great powers like Britain, Germany, France and Japan.

Moreover, so long as the Soviet Union practices party tyranny and terror at home and promotes aggression abroad, it will remain capable of treachery toward the United States. Nor can I believe that those dwindling Americans who still believe human freedom to be the highest good, will be willing to share world rule with double-talking Bolsheviks.

For these reasons I disapprove of any form of disarmament even with inspection that is not accompanied by political changes in communist countries. What freedom needs is not a loosening of our alliances but their consolidation into an overwhelming bloc impervious to Moscow's divisive actions and deceptive talk of "peaceful coexistence."

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, now, without further delay, an in-depth study of the Federal Government's bureaucratic sprawl must be undertaken. The House Republican policy committee urges the immediate consideration and enactment of legislation sponsored and introduced by Republican Members that would establish a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

There is today an administrative crisis within the executive branch of the Federal Government. Hastily enacted and often times competing programs have been stacked one upon another until it is impossible for State and local governments to know what is available for what purpose or even where to go for specific information. For example, five agencies of the Federal Government are presently involved in administering Federal programs for community water supply, sewers, and sewage treatment facilities. There are more than 260 Federal programs bearing on poverty problems that are administered by 16 separate departments and agencies.

Since 1960, as reflected by the following chart, the number of Federal employees has increased by 18 percent and the Federal payroll by almost 50 percent:

Federal civilian employment

Year	Total civilian employment	Payroll (billions)
1960.....	2,386,345	\$12.637
1961.....	2,372,445	13.648
1962.....	2,443,808	14.296
1963.....	2,493,374	15.347
1964.....	2,488,365	16.205
1965.....	2,479,489	17.239
1966.....	2,818,015	18.706

The runaway nature of the increase in Federal civilian employment was starkly dramatized by the actual results of a recent Presidential cutback order. In December 1965, President Johnson ordered a 1-percent cut—25,000 employees—to be achieved by June 30, 1966. However, as of June 30, 1966, the number of employees had risen by 192,000 instead of being reduced by 25,000.

In 1947, the Republican 80th Congress established the first Hoover Commission. In 1953, the Republican 83d Congress established the second Hoover Commission. These Commissions contributed markedly to the ability of the Congress and the agencies themselves to improve efficiency and to eliminate duplication of executive functions. Unfortunately, since the second Hoover Commission completed its work in 1955, there has been no overall study of the mushrooming agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

In recent years there has been a flood of poorly coordinated and oftentimes conflicting statements and directives of authority have, in certain instances, from the various executive departments and agencies. The lack of communication and the absence of clear-cut lines led to embarrassing confusion, dam-

aging contradictions and an apparent paralysis at the policymaking level of government. A new Commission could survey this problem and suggest ways to restore order, improve communications and coordinate decisions.

We believe that a major revision and reform of the executive branch is absolutely essential. Old departments and agencies that were created and organized to meet the problems of the first half of the 20th century should be carefully studied. It may be that certain agencies and departments should be phased out or combined in order to achieve maximum efficiency at a minimum cost. However, changes of this type must be made on the basis of careful and thorough studies that are conducted well above partisan politics and inter-agency power fights. A sporadic or a piecemeal reorganization could mean more rather than fewer problems.

A Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government could provide the thoughtful and careful reorganization that is so desperately needed. If the Commission had been in operation during the 89th Congress pursuant to the recommendations of the policy committee and the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation could have been an integral part of a general executive branch reorganization rather than just two isolated regroupings. Moreover the Johnson-Humphrey administration's proposed merger of the Commerce and Labor Departments could now be considered within the framework of an overall study and broad recommendations rather than on the basis of quickly garnered facts and surface appraisals.

FINO INTRODUCES BILL TO IMPROVE VIETNAM MAIL SERVICE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to first, extend free mailing privileges to all service personnel in service overseas or hospitalized as a result of injury incurred while on active duty; second, limit cost of airmailing parcels to servicemen to surface mail rates; and third, extend the airlift category of mail so that all servicemen overseas can get newspapers and such mail by plane, rather than only those in a combat zone.

I believe that we owe our boys in the field full-fledged and fast mail service. Certainly the expense of providing this service will be much less than the cost of a single jet bomber.

Given our troop deployment in Asia, a lot of men are stationed in out-of-the-way places which are not combat areas. Presently only the troops in combat areas

are on the receiving end of mailing privileges. This should be changed.

Perhaps even more important is the question of airmail rates for parcels. Unless a parcel is sent airmail, it will take forever to get to Vietnam, but the cost is prohibitive. My bill would let parcels sent to servicemen overseas go by airmail but at surface rates. This would make airmail costs to Vietnam reasonable.

If there is any question about how we can pay for these benefits in a deficit budget year, I have an easy answer—cut the poverty program and cut foreign aid.

This same bill has already been introduced by Post Office Committee Chairman DULSKI and other committee members.

THE AMERICAN INTEREST IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since becoming interested in the Rhodesian affair and the resolution imposing compulsory sanctions upon that country, I have discovered a great lack of understanding on the part of our own people about the possible results of our action in siding with England in connection with the imposition of the sanctions.

Recently Mr. John Davenport of New York, who is a journalist and an author, delivered an address entitled, "The American Interest in Southern Africa," which shows rather clearly the situation which exists in southern Africa, and why the majority rule cannot be imposed on either Rhodesia or the Republic of South Africa at this time.

Mr. Davenport's address follows:

THE AMERICAN INTEREST IN SOUTHERN AFRICA
(A critique of U.S. and U.N. policy toward a third of a continent, delivered before certain students of political economy in February 1967, by John Davenport¹)

Gentlemen, I am very honored to be asked to speak in a purely personal capacity, and not as the representative of any organization or publication, to this distinguished group. I do so with some reluctance because what I shall have to say will not be pleasant, and I am cognizant of the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I believe that my country, our country, is on dangerous collision course with what I shall be calling southern Africa and that our policies are currently misguided and misdirected. It is time that we recognized this and tried in our individual capacities to rectify matters before incalculable harm is done.

As you all know, southern Africa, where it was my privilege to travel last summer, is an enormous and complex region. It includes the Republic of South Africa, its legal dependency, South West Africa, the newly declared independent state of Rhodesia, and finally the Portuguese possessions of Angola

¹Mr. Davenport is a New York journalist and author of the book, *The U.S. Economy*. Opinions herein contained are strictly personal and can be attributed to no organization or publication.

and Mozambique, to which I can refer only in passing. It is an area of many races, cultures, and languages. It also includes many natural wonders—rolling veldt, high mountains, rivers and waterfalls, and abundant game parks where lions, tigers, elephants, and other wild animals roam at will.

But as you have perhaps already gathered, it is not these animals of which I wish to speak. My concern is rather with certain big game hunters who have taken it upon themselves to wage an unrelenting ideological war against this southern third of the continent, where it is charged that the white man continues to exploit, and indeed to enslave, the black man through such condemned practices as apartheid, discrimination, denial of majority rule, and other so-called crimes against humanity.

I propose to deal with some of these charges in the context of actual fact, but let me make one point abundantly plain in the beginning. Even if conditions in this part of the world were as bad as they are so often painted—and it is a big if—this would not in my opinion justify present U.N. and U.S. actions. United States foreign policy cannot, in my judgment, be based on vague ideological abstractions such as majority rule, one man one vote, and other clichés, good or bad. Foreign policy, which implies in the last analysis willingness to fight, must be based on hard-headed assessment of this country's fundamental national interest.

THE POWERHOUSE OF SOUTH AFRICA

I believe this holds particularly true in the case of the Republic of South Africa, where, at first glance anyway, the U.S. national interest would seem to dictate a policy of accommodation, understanding, and respect for international decorum. This is partly because the U.S. generally honors economic progress, and certainly South Africa can display plenty of that. We Americans are justly proud of the fact that, with only about 6% of the world's population, we produce about 33% of the world's goods and services. Well, the Republic of South Africa can in a way match this record. With just about 6% of the population of the African continent, and with only 4% of its land area, it produces no less than 25% of the entire continent's product, and some 40% of its industrial output!

That is, indeed, a stunning statistic, but it is not all that binds or should bind South Africa and the West together. U.S. business firms have now invested well over \$600 million in South Africa's mines and factories, and Britain has invested four times that amount. In 1965 South African imports ran to no less than \$2.5 billion—one quarter of the imports of the entire African continent, and its commercial exports ran to about \$1.5 billion. It is a major producer of uranium and the world's largest producer of chrome, manganese, and diamonds. More important still, it supplies no less than 70% of the gold production of the West, which balances its accounts with the outside world and which also serves as the vital buttress of our international monetary system. Finally, let me remind you that South Africa, by its very geographic position, has certain strategic advantages. Its tracking station is used in almost every space shot which the U.S. makes. It has harbors which command the vital Atlantic approaches to the Indian Ocean.

Now given all that, and given the fact that South Africa leads all other African states in per capita income, one might suppose that our relations with this republic would be of the closest. This is not the case. At recent Congressional hearings various pressure groups advocated that U.S. business should cut all connections with South Africa, and the United Nations has passed no less than 100 resolutions condemning South Africa and its policies. What policies? You

all know the answer. The dread word here is *apartheid*, meaning specifically the separation of the races, and it is on that rock that all efforts to maintain friendly relations with South Africa and its dependency, South West Africa, have foundered.

TWO FACES OF APARTHEID

So I feel today in duty bound to comment on this business of apartheid, laying down some broad distinctions or guidelines in the beginning which are all too often overlooked. In the first place, separation of the races is not necessarily the same thing as *exploitation* of one race by another, and I believe that rising income levels for all in South Africa, and increasing education for all, tend to make good this distinction. In the second place, apartheid is not the same thing as the problem of majority rule, though linked with it. In the third place, I must say that I find nothing abhorrent in the separation of the races so long as such separation is *voluntarily* chosen by those concerned. *De facto* and voluntary separation of the races has always existed and probably always will exist to greater or less extent. It is because South Africa has made *de facto* separation a *de jure* separation, because the state has intervened to make separation stick, that its policies prick the conscience of the West and of many of us in this room.

Yet I also believe it is necessary to understand how these policies evolved and what exactly they entail if we are to pass rational judgment in this matter. And here the whole history of South Africa differs from the American experience. When the Cavalier and the Puritan—your ancestors and mine—first came to American shores, they found it already inhabited by a fairly large population of native Indian tribes, which they proceeded, I am sorry to say, to exploit and indeed nearly to exterminate. That was *our* solution of the only real colonial problem we have ever faced. South African experience is quite different. When in the 17th century Dutch and then English settlers landed at Cape Town, they found a few scattered tribes such as the Hottentots, but otherwise the great area which today comprises the Republic lay bare and empty. It was only later, when the white man pushed into the interior, that he encountered large numbers of black, or Bantus, pushing at the same time down from central Africa, that a real racial problem arose.

And this problem, it is important to note, has grown to its present proportions precisely because the whites did *not* kill off these alien races as we Americans did. On the contrary, they allowed them to wax and multiply and to increase their numbers through further immigration. Even today it is extraordinary that thousands of blacks from northern Africa continue to enter the Republic which reputedly enslaves them. As the saying goes, they continue to "vote with their feet" for South Africa precisely because they find higher living standards and economic advancement.

The second point I would emphasize is that, due to this multiplication and immigration, the racial mix in South Africa today is a highly complicated one. The descendants of the early Dutch and British pioneers, who largely built the country and who, unlike the European in other parts of Africa, have no Western homeland to return to, now number about 3,500,000. Early mingling of whites and Hottentots has produced the so-called Coloreds, now numbering nearly 2,000,000. Indentured servants coming from India in the 19th century have built up their own Indian society numbering about 500,000. Finally, and this is the real problem, there are now some 12,500,000 blacks or Bantus, belonging to many different tribes and speaking no less than seven different languages and many more dialects, who in part live in South African cities and on its farms and in part

live on native reservations initially set aside for them to prevent their exploitation.

Now it is the considered policy of the South African government, which is today controlled by the white minority, that no good can come of trying to jumble and mix this great diversity of racial groups into a single centralized nation state along European democratic lines. Believing so, apartheid has taken two different forms, one negative and one positive. Where whites and blacks live in close contact with each other in city and on farm, they can work together by day but they must occupy separate living quarters. To make this separation stick involves minute rules as to where and how people shall live. It also involves minute rules, applying especially to the Bantu, as to when and how he can enter urban areas and how he can shift jobs. His "passbook", as the saying goes, is his vital passport so far as his movement within the country is concerned.

Now I cannot say that as an old-fashioned liberal I like this system. It involves a high concentration of government power and often discretionary power. It cuts all too often against the grain of the free market, which, as our good friend Professor Hutt as well as Dr. von Mises have again and again pointed out, works best where men and women can work where they choose, for what they can get and for what they are worth. Yet I am also bound to say that I see no way by which the system could be suddenly reformed or abolished without unbearable racial tension, and I must also point out that under it very considerable social progress has been made. In the early days South Africa tried the experiment of just letting the Bantu immigrate to the city at his own free will. This bred some of the worst slums in the world. Today that is getting to be a thing of the past. While controlling the influx of Bantus into the cities, the government has largely rehoused all that are there. Today new homes for non-whites are going up at the rate of sixty per day. There have also been enormous steps forward in education. Over 80% of all Bantu children of school age are now in school. The educational record is far better than in most of the other states of Africa.

Finally, I would point out that South Africa has not stopped short at just keeping the races separate where they exist today. It is planning for the future in what can be called a positive way. As noted, a large segment of the Bantu population—indeed, 40% of it—still lives on native reserves of homelands scattered around the country. The government is making a very considerable effort to develop these homelands into going economic concerns and to give their inhabitants a kind of home rule. In theory, at least, every Bantu, no matter where he works, will be a citizen of a so-called Bantustan. He will vote for his parliament there just as white South Africans now vote for their central parliament in Cape Town. Progress along this line has been made in an area called the Transkei. It has also been given a boost by the fact that the former British protectorate of Basutoland has now become the independent state of Lesotho, and that the protectorate of Swaziland will presently achieve this condition. These areas are completely surrounded by South Africa, which is now forging with them the closest political and economic ties. I suppose that I should offend many modern liberals if I called what is going on an experiment in "creative federalism." I will say that the principle of federalism as applied to different races and, indeed, different nationalities holds out great hope for South Africa and for all of southern Africa.

In any case, you will see that the domestic and also the foreign policy of South Africa is far more constructive than you are apt to gather from your newspapers. Admittedly,

much remains to be done. For while the theory of separate development as enunciated by the late Hendrik Verwoerd may indeed be a way to harmonize the interests of the European and the Bantu, it leaves unresolved what will happen to other groups—notably the status of the Coloreds, who are tied in closely with the white community but who are today denied political privileges. Yet there is a strong pressure within South Africa itself to resolve this particular problem, and that is precisely where the pressure should be coming from. What solves nothing is the constant pounding of outside critics who prefer to talk in the stale language of coming "blood baths" rather than to face realities. What is being done merits better than epithets and scorn. It deserves, if not blanket approval, at least the civilized give and take of opinion in what Clarence Randall has called "constructive dialogue." That too is my hope for U.S. relations with South Africa.

THE CASE OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Unfortunately, those relations are now being disturbed and brought to the boiling point, not just by often ill-informed opinion about South Africa, but by overt attack in the United Nations and elsewhere on its policies in South West Africa and by the situation that has developed in Rhodesia. I should like to deal with South West Africa first because it is probably least familiar to you. It is an enormous and largely arid territory twice the size of California and very sparsely populated (less than two inhabitants per square mile—that's right, per square mile!), which stretches down along the Atlantic between Angola to the north and South Africa. Despite its rugged terrain and sparse population, it is an area of great strategic value precisely because it commands the southern approaches to the Republic and because it likewise commands shipping trade down the long African Atlantic coastline.

As you will recall, this strange territory, now populated by some 75,000 whites and 450,000 blacks, has had a weird political history. In the 19th century the Germans under Kaiser Wilhelm made an abortive attempt to colonize it. In World War I the territory was captured by British and South African troops, and at that time, and indeed later, South Africa could easily have annexed it. Instead it accepted a Class C League of Nations mandate over the territory under a "sacred trust" agreement to care for the "material and moral" well-being of its inhabitants. From that day in 1919 forward, South Africa has, as was its right to do under the old mandate, administered South West Africa as an integral part of its own territory. Economically the two are linked by interconnecting railroad lines and roads and by a common currency system, without controls or tariff barriers of any kind. Politically they are linked through an arrangement whereby a provincial parliament, for which, it should be noted, only whites vote, is given certain local autonomy, with power over defense and internal security resting with the South African government.

Now it is not surprising that the other and newly independent African states should view this persistence of what they refer to as "colonialism" in their midst with concern, if not with deep hatred. What is surprising and sad is the amount of venom that has been put into the attack to detach South West Africa entirely from South Africa. That attack has taken several different lines. It is contended that South Africa has no rights whatever in the territory since her mandate lapsed with the death of the old League of Nations after World War II. It is contended that the United Nations as the legal successor to the League of Nations now has full supervisory rights over this immense area. And finally, it is contended that, given these supervisory rights, the U.N. must now become the launching pad for propelling

South West Africa into complete independence with the initiation of full majority rule, one man one vote, and all the rest of it.

I shall not try to comment at length here on all the twisted legalities involved in this dispute. I would suggest that on the evidence South Africa may have as much right to the control of South West Africa as the U.S. had in the case of Texas; and I would deny strenuously that the United Nations is in any meaningful sense the successor to the old League. I would also emphasize that most of the charges brought against South Africa rule—exploitation, enslavement, etc., etc.—are simply untrue and were so proved in the recent World Court case brought by Ethiopia and Nigeria. But what concerns me most is the whole atmosphere of unreality which broods over recent U.N. debates.

In this matter our U.N. representatives are constantly referring to the rights and the aspirations of the "people" of South West Africa. I would respectfully ask them what "people" they are referring to, for as in the case of South Africa we are dealing, not with one people, but several. There are first of all the Europeans, who over the years have been chiefly responsible for developing the territory's agriculture, fisheries, and industries. As noted, there are also some 450,000 non-Europeans who work partly on South West Africa's farms and in its factories but who also remain in very large numbers in its native reserves as in South Africa itself. By far the largest of these native homelands is a place which, I daresay, you have never heard of. It is called Ovamboland, lying far to the north along the Cuanyne River at the Angola border and comprising land which is largely cultivatable given sufficient water. The Ovambos, who incidentally lived here long before the white man arrived, now comprise no less than 45% of the black population of the territory.

Now that is another stunning statistic and one which puts the whole matter of apartheid and majority rule into new perspective. For if self-determination and majority rule were granted tomorrow, it would be the Ovambos who would hold the majority, leaving other tribes to the south as discontented, hostile, and explosive minorities. I do not believe that the Ovambos want such power or could possibly exercise it if it were granted to them. It would seem far wiser to develop at least this area of South West Africa as a separate entity within the larger whole, and that is precisely what is being done. Large irrigation projects are now being installed in the north. Very considerable local autonomy is being given to Ovambo chiefs and to their own peculiar institutions of government, and this is likewise taking place in other reserves—the counterparts of the Bantustans in South Africa itself. Within a generation, and given further educational effort, might not this effort at home rule and this kind of federalism serve the divergent peoples of South West Africa far better than current U.N. proposals to create one more completely independent, centralized, and no doubt strife-torn democracy?

At any rate, this is the way that South African policy and administration are heading, and on the evidence this is contributing to the well-being of the territory. Between 1940 and 1965, South West's per capita income jumped from a bare \$42 to \$380—a faster advance than in most of Africa. This was partly the result of government subsidy, but it is also the result of creating the conditions of stability and confidence where private enterprise can take hold in cattle raising, sheep raising, and in the exploitation of mineral resources—chiefly copper and diamonds. If South African administration ends, who will step into the vacuum left behind? The United Nations is hard put to it today to pay its own administrative bills, let alone finance an area of this kind. Perhaps the United States will step in, but does the U.S. taxpayer

really want to assume this load and this responsibility even if we could fulfill it? Once again my counsel is to go slow, to maintain our critical faculties, but to abstain from and if necessary to veto those ringing declarations in the U.N. which embitter our relations in all of southern Africa and which, if ever taken seriously, could lead on to war. For make no mistake about it, if the U.N. ever actively tried to intervene in South West Africa with force, South Africa would oppose force with force.

AND NOW RHODESIA

And this leads me, gentlemen, to that third area of southern Africa—namely, Rhodesia—where again, unhappily, discord and even threats of force are in the air. In Rhodesia, to perhaps an even greater extent than in South West Africa, the U.S. has been led to a wholly tragic and dangerous confrontation which, however resolved, again demonstrates that the road to perdition in statecraft is, indeed, paved with good intentions. The blunt fact is that as I write the U.S., a nation of 190 million people, is waging an open and declared economic war against a small country of 4 million people which has never harmed American life or limb and which is one of the few countries that I know which accept an American passport without visa! How in the name of common sense, let alone justice, did we ever get ourselves into this appalling situation?

The story is a sad one, and once again some background is necessary. As you all know, Rhodesia, lying just to the north of South Africa, was conquered by Cecil Rhodes in the 19th century and for some time was developed by a private chartered company. In 1923 it became a part of the British Empire under special arrangements which gave it virtual home rule and a strong promise of independence. Such independence might in fact have come years ago had not Rhodesia, at British urging, joined in the creation of a federation which included the former colonies of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In 1963 that federation came to an end when first Nyasaland (now Malawi) and then Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) packed their bags and walked out of the Commonwealth.

In view of their breakaway, the Rhodesian government confidently expected that Rhodesia would also be untied from Britain's apron strings—the more so because in 1961 a constitution had been adopted under British sponsorship which guaranteed the franchise to all Rhodesians, black and white, who met certain qualifications in terms of income, property, and/or education. It was not to be. Throughout 1964 the British government, with one eye fixed on those areas of Africa which have always looked on Rhodesia with suspicion, kept stiffening the terms on which independence could be granted. Indeed, at one point it wanted a definite timetable as to when Rhodesia's 4 million blacks would be accorded full majority rule whatever their qualifications. In the upshot the white minority of 220,000 rallied behind the government of Ian Smith and in November, 1964, Smith made his fateful declaration of independence.

Now I am not here to defend the prudence of that declaration, for as events turned out Ian Smith, a former RAF pilot, by the way, was taking some fearful risks. I am here to question the wisdom of my country's joining with Britain in a policy of economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and to question the reasoning which led us to that step. In the beginning voluntary sanctions voted by the United Nations were backed by our State Department on the argument that we must support and follow the lead of our old and trusted ally Britain. I yield to none in my admiration of the Britain of 1940 when she stood alone under Winston Churchill. I am less than enchanted with the Britain of Har-

old Wilson. But my main point is that the argument that the U.S. was bound to follow the British "lead" in the matter of sanctions was and always has been hokum. For one thing we Americans once had a little argument with Britain in the matter of independence, and I do not recall that Washington or Jefferson ever fell for the doctrine of the King, right or wrong. But more practically I would suggest to you that in the twentieth century, with most of Britain's Empire gone with the winds of change, we are simply deluding ourselves in talking about the British "lead." The blunt fact is that it would be quite impossible for Britain to maintain sanctions against Rhodesia for a moment without U.S. collaboration and connivance. No British cruiser could or would stop a tanker of an American oil company from delivering oil to Rhodesia. What stopped the flow of oil, or attempted to stop it, was the pressure of our own President and Administration on major U.S. oil companies to prevent delivery. I have constitutional doubts as to whether the President acted legally. In any case, make no mistake about it, this was *our* blockade.

As you know, initial efforts to bring down the Smith regime by voluntary sanctions proved a miserable failure. Oil flowed in from South Africa, and during 1965 the Rhodesian economy survived fairly well. So nothing would do but for Britain to go to the U.N. Security Council and get a vote for *mandatory* sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, and these are now in force. Whether Rhodesia can withstand this second onslaught remains to be seen, but I for one trust that she does, the more so because I find the further arguments made for mandatory sanctions by the U.S. and the United Nations wholly unconvincing.

These arguments are two in number. The first is that the Smith government is denying majority rule in Rhodesia and that in doing so it is violating the purposes of the United Nations which is to promote "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." Well, I sometimes wonder whether those who put forward this argument have ever read the present Rhodesian Constitution whose principles were laid down in 1961 and reaffirmed in 1965. The most remarkable fact of that Constitution is that so far as the franchise in Rhodesia is concerned, there is no mention of race, creed, or color.

As I have indicated, all Rhodesian citizens can vote—some on the A. roll where qualifications are higher, some on the B. roll where they are lower—who can show a certain level of income, property or education. It is true that these qualifications especially for the A. roll are relatively high and it is true that in fact white Rhodesians do still control its Parliament. But blacks are also represented there and as education proceeds, as it is now proceeding, at a very rapid pace, more and more black Rhodesians will in fact be given the vote and will find representation. How sad then that the U.S. and the U.N. should pick on this particular country to vent their wrath or their prejudices when there might be so many others to choose from. Does majority rule *now* obtain in Soviet Russia? Does it obtain in Eastern Europe? Does it obtain in large portions of South America or in Africa itself? You all know the answer. If the U.S. is to follow this kind of logic to its bitter end, we must declare war against two-thirds of the civilized and uncivilized world.

The second argument for the application of sanctions is even more fantastic. It is that Rhodesia, with a population of only 4,000,000, is a "threat to the peace" and so falls within the ambit of Chapter VII of the charter which deals with such threats. But it is obvious to anyone reading that chapter that threats to the peace means armed

aggression across state borders, and who is making those threats? Certainly not Rhodesia. We are here involved in a cloud-cuckoo-land of legal hair splitting which I am glad to say that such a fine international lawyer as Dean Acheson has fully exposed. In plain English, the present logic of the U.N. comes down to this. If I as a private citizen do something which annoys my neighbor, and if that neighbor starts out to threaten and bully me, then I, not he, am threatening the peace and can be held accountable. Such argument would not stand up for a moment in a U.S. court of law, and I for one find it ridiculous when applied to the law of nations. The truth is that present U.N. action is probably illegal in terms of the Charter itself. It is certainly not benefiting the people of Rhodesia, and it is fundamentally against the U.S. interest itself. I conclude that sanctions should never have been imposed in the first place and that they should be lifted forthwith—in concert with other nations if possible, if not, unilaterally by this country.

FREEDOM AND ORDER

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I end my specific survey of these three great trouble centers in southern Africa and my specific assessment of U.S. policy toward the same. It should be clear to you now why my concern is not with the lions and tigers of this region but rather with the ideological game hunters who have chosen to mount a costly safari into southern Africa which in the end is not worth the price. I would say to these gentlemen—be they politicians or statesmen or just plain troublemakers—"Put up your guns." In the phrase of Charles Burton Marshall of Johns Hopkins University, "Simmer down!"

That is sound advice for many members of the United Nations, who have turned that organization away from its initial objective of promoting peaceful progress. It is also sound advice for U.S. policymakers both in and out of the U.N. If our objective is to promote stability in Africa, then we must avoid pulling down the whole structure of going societies, leaving nothing but disorder and turmoil in their place. More fundamentally, I submit that the problems of Africa cannot be solved simply by trying to export from the West certain glittering generalities which we take all too much for granted at home. In the United States and in Britain we have come to assume that because majority rule "works" in certain highly advanced countries it will work everywhere and will resolve all difficulties. We forget that even Winston Churchill was once led to remark: "Democracy is the worst form of government—until other forms are considered."

In any case, we must realize that current efforts to transplant Western political ideas into alien soils without a long period of preparation has proved something less than a brilliant success. It is remarkable in this connection how the so-called "show-pieces" of the African continent have changed before our very eyes. Yesterday the show-piece was Ghana, until, of course, it turned into a dictatorship. Then came Nigeria, which is now riven into contending factions. Today it is Kenya, where all the fierceness of Kenyatta and the Mau Mau has apparently been forgotten, and all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps so. Yet the central fact to grasp about all these situations is that in no part of Africa are majorities really effective. In all countries relatively small minorities actually rule. I am not presuming to say whether they rule well or ill. I am saying that even in the north progress toward true constitutional two-party republican government is slow and halting.

Does this mean, then, that in the end we shall have to choose between minority rule

of the blacks or minority rule of the whites? Is it really that bad? There are those in South Africa and elsewhere who talk that way, but I, for one, hope they are wrong, and I believe that there is some evidence to show that they are wrong. If my analysis of apartheid is correct, then it holds out the promise that in time both black men and white men in South Africa and South West Africa will enjoy very large political privileges. If the Rhodesian Constitution means what it says, then over time—and provided sanctions do not destroy the economy—more and more blacks will in fact join the voting roll in the formation of a true multi-racial society. Finally, I would point out that in Portuguese Angola and Mozambique still a third approach to the race problem is being tried—namely, completely free social intercourse and indeed intermarriage between whites and blacks at levels where they are culturally equal. I rejoice that in southern Africa there are not one but many approaches toward allowing the races to live in harmony together. The one thread that runs through all of these approaches is that certain human standards of decency, of education, and of civilization exist and that these standards cannot be lightly thrown away. On this point I honor Ian Smith when he says he is fighting, not for white against black, but for the enduring values of civilization itself.

It is these values that we fortunate Americans should seek to protect and to promote, however the chips may fall. I have said that the first business of foreign policy is to protect and further the national interest. That interest is a broad one. It should involve cultivating good relations with those nations on which we are dependent for raw materials and trade, and in avoiding threats and commitments which can only lead to war—economic or otherwise. It should also involve encouraging where we can a world of individual liberty under law, with the emphasis on the *individual*, not pressure groups, and a full realization that law implies not revolution but evolution, not chaos but *order*. In southern Africa we may yet have a chance to further those ideals if we finally come to realize that political arrangements are only means to higher ends, and that in the end it is the ends that count. Our mistakes in policy, in my judgment, derive to no small degree from reversing that equation. We have been so busy preaching the virtues of democracy that we have forgotten that the purpose of democracy is, in the last analysis, human betterment. Perhaps this is why we have lost friends and influence in the lower third of a great continent. It is time we regained them.

I HOPE MY MESSAGE REACHES THE HEARTS OF AMERICANS

MR. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter from a soldier in Vietnam who simply cannot understand how we can justify expanding trade with the Soviet Union and the Soviet-bloc nations when these nations are supplying assistance to North Vietnam, our treacherous enemy in the Vietnam war. Possibly, he has no background in political science; perhaps he never served in the diplomatic corps. Nevertheless, his credentials are impressive;

he is serving in Vietnam and knows the brutality of the enemy. Unlike some political scientists and diplomats he is, of necessity, in very, very close touch with reality. He asks:

How can we trade with a country which aids the soldier who tries to kill me?

If I favored this trade with the enemy, I would be hard pressed to answer him. He raises other questions that some officials may someday be embarrassed to answer. His letter reads:

DEAR SIR: Morale of our troops is certainly not being helped by the U.S. expanding its foreign trade with Communists, e.g., Soviet-Bloc nations. I'm presently serving in the U.S. Army in Viet Nam, and find the thought of trading materials with even pro-Communist countries disheartening, distasteful and two-faced.

How can we trade with a country which aids the soldier who tries to kill me?

Don't the people back home realize that men are dying here because of aid furnished the V.C.? I'm sure they do; then how can they in their hearts indirectly and with premeditation support such a two-faced foreign policy?

I personally find such Americans (who can help another country to help the V.C.) sickening to all that I have ever been taught by sound American principles. People like that shouldn't be American citizens. Let them come fight this nasty war sponsored by Communists. Let them justify to the children of a dead U.S. soldier, their eagerness to trade with supporters of the V.C.

What is happening to the morals of the U.S. people? How can they turn on the men who are dying for their freedom and the freedom of a nation which appears so far from America's shore. Would Premier Ky trade with the V.C. or Communist-Bloc nations? Hell NO! He has that much loyalty to his own troops.

Is it too much to expect civilians to assist in their ways of helping us with this war? I pray not. I pray that God will protect us all and guide our leaders towards righteousness. May He guide L.B.J. and the Congress towards the basic American principles as founded in 1776.

Please excuse a hand-written letter as typewriters are not always easy to come by. I hope my message reaches the hearts of Americans so we may unify ourselves in the defense of freedom which our fathers sacrificed to give us. Let us not throw it away and compromise our integrity towards our loyal and dying servicemen.

Just in case some may have doubts concerning the assistance which is being rendered by the Soviet Union, for example, to North Vietnam, the U.S. News & World Report of January 30, 1967, should provide some enlightenment. In the subheading of the article entitled "Russia: The Enemy in Vietnam?" the magazine states:

More and more, there's a "made in Moscow" mark on the weapons used to kill Americans in Vietnam. Facts now emerging make it clear that it wouldn't be so much of a war for the U.S. if it weren't for the Russians.

The article goes on to demonstrate how necessary is Soviet aid if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are to continue to send young American soldiers to their graves.

It is unfortunately true that American citizens sometimes forget that they are the final judge of our foreign policy and not the officials in Washington. I hope that our experience in the downfall of Nationalist China to the Communists in

1949 is not repeated in Vietnam. I agree with the statement made by Hon. John F. Kennedy in 1949:

This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President frittered away.

Again our young men are fighting to preserve freedom in a far-off land. May we hear their plea as presented in the above letter by one from their ranks:

I hope my message reaches the hearts of Americans so we may unify ourselves in the defense of freedom which our fathers sacrificed to give us. Let us not throw it away and compromise our integrity towards our loyal and dying servicemen.

I insert the article, "Russia: The Enemy in Vietnam?" in the RECORD at this point:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 30, 1967]

RUSSIA: THE ENEMY IN VIETNAM?

SAIGON.—Soviet Russia, not Red China, is turning out to be the major enemy of the U.S. in Vietnam. A steadily expanding Russian involvement is causing this war to be the second most costly in dollars in American history.

The American people have not previously been told of this situation that is regarded by military commanders with increasing concern.

Instead, high officials in Washington have pictured the Russians as anxious for peace.

The U.S. policy has been to portray Communist China as responsible for prolonging war and to try to buy Russian friendship by American concessions in many fields.

Sinews of war. The facts, just beginning to emerge, tell a different story.

The Red Chinese, torn by troubles at home, still are supplying light weapons, ammunition and rice to the North Vietnamese. Their aid is helpful to guerrilla forces when it reaches the South. It is the Russians, however, who are furnishing the real sinews for major and prolonged war.

Extent of Soviet participation is great and expanding. The Russians now are investing close to 1 billion dollars a year in the war. With this billion—and no real loss of life—they are helping to force the U.S. to wage a war that now is taking thousands of American lives and costing directly about 30 billion dollars a year.

On January 19, U.S. headquarters reported that U.S. forces in Vietnam suffered in the second week of January their heaviest casualties of the war—1,188 men killed or wounded in action.

The U.S., because it is bogged down in Vietnam and burdened with over-all defense spending that is to reach 73 billion dollars or more in the year ahead, is hampered in trying to keep Russia from forging ahead in the nuclear-arms race.

The Russians, with the U.S. tied down, have made a major "breakthrough" in anti-missile defense and are pushing ahead with that decisively important defense while the U.S. talks and delays because of money problems.

The Russian investment in the Vietnam war today is impressive. The chart on pages 28 and 29 spells out that investment not only in terms of dollars, but also in terms of specific armament and vital technical assistance.

The big question. Says a top U.S. officer: "There no longer is any question about it—the Russians are at war with us in Vietnam in a very real sense. They are more important than most people realize in the operation of the war. Most of the trucks that move the needed supplies from North to South Vietnam, for example, come from Rus-

sia or her satellites. Many of the automatic weapons that we capture from North Vietnamese troops are of Russian manufacture. Most of our plane losses have resulted from the use of Soviet Russia's antiaircraft guns, missiles or MIG jet fighters."

From another officer: "If Russia were to pull out of the war, so would Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia and other suppliers of vitally needed equipment. Red China alone couldn't start to carry the supply burden alone. Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi would have a tough time continuing his infiltration. It would have a noticeable effect on the war, maybe a decisive one."

Soviet aid to North Vietnam trickled along at an average yearly rate of 35 million dollars until early in 1965, when, even before U.S. began bombing in the North, the Russians started moving in a big way—with SAM antiaircraft missiles, jet fighters, military vehicles, oil, other paraphernalia of war.

The Russian rockets and guns are directly responsible for mounting U.S. losses over the North. Almost 1,000 SAM's have been fired at U.S. planes. These Soviet missiles, launched by Russian-trained crews, have themselves destroyed 30 U.S. planes and contributed in a large measure to an over-all loss in the North of more than 460 U.S. planes.

Cost to the Russians in spent missiles: about 25 million dollars. Cost to the U.S. in planes alone: more than 1 billion dollars.

The North Vietnamese landscape is also studded with conventional antiaircraft positions, about 6,000 in all. The original antiaircraft system was installed by the Chinese. Now bigger guns are coming in. They are Russian.

The North Vietnamese Air Force now consists of 75 to 100 fighter planes and a handful of light bombers supplied by the Soviet Union. About one fifth of the force are the most up-to-date MIG-21s; the remainder, MIG-15s and MIG-17s. The MIG's are replaced by the Russians as they are lost in the fighting.

Russian technicians, too. Intelligence sources estimate there are upward of 2,000 Russian technicians working at air bases and at SAM sites. North Vietnamese pilots are trained in Russia and supervised by Soviet fliers when they return to Hanoi.

Within the past few months, the Russians have taught North Vietnamese to man approximately 350 SAM missiles and an estimated 3,000 antiaircraft guns. Other Soviet advisers help operate North Vietnam's industry, its coal mines and the port of Haiphong, and are helping in the building or rebuilding of hydroelectric plants, other major works.

For the first time, Soviet helicopters are being spotted in North Vietnam. Russian cargo aircraft are also making an appearance.

The North Vietnamese war machine runs almost entirely on Russian oil. In the past 18 months, the Russians shipped in 300,000 metric tons. The Chinese provided almost none. Last month alone, the Soviets shipped nearly 25,000 metric tons of gasoline and oil into Haiphong.

The Russians use ships to transport 80 per cent of their aid to North Vietnam, the balance going by rail or by plane across Red China despite severe restrictions set up by Peking. All told, the Russians are said to be delivering 80,000 tons of goods a month to Hanoi.

Intelligence sources in Saigon report that the Soviet ships going to Haiphong carry not only civilian goods, as the Reds insist, but jet aircraft, SAM's radar gear and anti-aircraft guns.

During 1966, an average of one ship a day reached Haiphong. Six Soviet ships docked there during the past 2 weeks.

Tonnage by sea from all sources—Russia, China, East Europe and non-Communist countries—was estimated at 2 million tons in 1966. Of that, the Russian share was esti-

mated at half the total, Red China's about one fourth.

The point is stressed that the number of Chinese ships entering Haiphong went down in 1966, the Russians total up.

China's role. Chinese propagandists, pushing their fight for world Communist leadership, maintain that Peking still is the main supplier to the Communists of Vietnam. "What the Chinese are bragging about," says one Western expert, "is volume. Tonnage from Red China may run higher, but the dollar-per-ton value and the strategic value of Russian aid is much greater."

In the words of another expert: "The vital suppliers are the Soviets. If the flow of supplies from Red China were cut off, the Soviets would be able to handle the whole job. The Chinese could not if the situation were reversed."

The Russians, when possible, avoid shipping vital items across Red China. One reason, according to intelligence sources: The Chinese insist on opening all shipments crossing their territory, often stamp, "From China With Love", over the Russian characters.

Reports are heard, also, that the Chinese have delayed shipments of SAM's and late-model MIG's while their technicians removed them from the crates to make copies for themselves.

Soviet prudence? It is agreed here in Saigon that the Russians have not gone as far as they could in arming North Vietnam. "In fact," says one U.S. official, "the Russians have been extremely prudent in some ways. We think it very likely that Hanoi has asked for such items as battlefield missiles for use in the South, perhaps even for submarines to use against the Seventh Fleet in the Tonkin Gulf."

Another senior officer adds:

"It is clear what the Russians are up to. They want to keep us tied up in knots out here. So far they have refused Hanoi the weapons to wage a bloody campaign against U.S. forces in the South, but is that to be permanent? The Soviets want Hanoi to win, and they are playing a very clever and cagey game."

Top analysts insist that Russia's basic strategy for conquest in the world has not changed; to weaken the U.S. position wherever it can in the world, while the Soviets seek to strengthen their own.

Russia is viewed as supporting a "war of national liberation" in Vietnam in precisely the way foretold by their top strategists.

Despite an impression fostered in Washington that the Russians really want peace in Vietnam, analysts here find the evidence in the other direction. "The Soviet Union," reports one official, "has done nothing publicly or privately to help start negotiations. We don't buy the Moscow line that they have no influence in Hanoi."

In view of the Russian record in Vietnam, fighting men here are puzzled at what seems to be efforts by U.S. to make one accommodation after another with the Soviets—space treaties, airline pacts, efforts to set up more consulates in both countries, attempts to expand East-West trade while war goes on.

In Washington, Senator Karl E. Mundt (Rep.), of South Dakota, said on January 18 he was appalled at the number of key U.S. items already being traded behind the Iron Curtain. He said: "We're doing this in the face of the fact that every sophisticated weapon being used to kill our boys in Vietnam is furnished by Russia. The deaths of many of them could be marked: 'Made in Moscow.'"

Soviet military aid to north Vietnam

	Millions
1955-64 (Soviet figures).....	\$35
1965 (Soviet figures).....	550
1966 (estimated).....	700
1967 (Soviet promise).....	800

VITAL WAR SUPPLIES—EVERYTHING FROM OIL TO MODERN JETS

Supplied by Russia in past 18 months

SAM surface-to-air missiles, antiaircraft batteries, 75 to 100 MIG warplanes, coastal ships, IL-28 light bombers, field-artillery pieces, helicopters, advanced radar defense system, heavy-construction equipment, bridge-building materials, military trucks, rolled-steel products, fertilizer, pyrites, drugs, surgical instruments, 300,000 metric tons of oil, cargo transports, heavy infantry weapons.

In addition, Soviets are training hundreds of North Vietnamese pilots in Soviet Union, have sent about 2,000 Russian technicians into North Vietnam to train and help SAM missile crews. Soviet experts help run North Vietnam's mining, power, engineering and technical industries, serve at the port of Haiphong, at Hanoi factories, supervise construction of new plants.

AMERICA'S CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the March 1967 edition of Reader's Digest carries a provocative and sobering interview with Nathan F. Twining the retired Air Force general who served as chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1957 to 1960. Asked about the present state of U.S. defenses, General Twining stated:

During the past few years our ability to deter an enemy attack has been severely eroded. I am convinced that if the present trend is not reversed, and fast, the United States will soon find itself in very serious danger.

It will be remembered that the United States and the U.S.S.R. agreed to a moratorium on nuclear testing in 1958, at which time it was stated that little progress was to be expected by further development of nuclear explosives and that the field of missile defense was designated as particularly barren. In 1961 the Soviets broke the moratorium and conducted high-yield tests which placed them well beyond us in the area of very-high-yield technology. Not too long thereafter the United States signed the test ban treaty which substantially froze our technology in the very-high-yield area.

In the field of missile defense, the situation is equally alarming. Attempts were made in 1963 to allot money for initial planning on an antiballistic missile defense system. Such attempts were defeated and to this day we are still debating the advisability of proceeding with the program. Meanwhile, it is now common knowledge that the Soviets are ahead of us in this area and have such a system, although to a limited degree.

After getting burnt on the 1958 moratorium, the United States signed the test ban treaty, thereby freezing the very-high-yield technological gap in favor of the Soviets. Now, with the Soviets ahead

in the antiballistic missile defense area, we are talking of signing another pact with Russia to limit the antiballistic missile defenses. The words of General Twining are worth remembering in this respect:

If we keep trying to appease the Soviets with foolish offers and concessions, and keep reducing our military capabilities toward their level, and also keep tying our military technology into unrealistic cost-effectiveness straitjackets, I believe we can look forward to a major crisis.

It is ironic that those who favor making concessions of various types to the Soviets' claim to be insuring peace and lessening tensions, when just the opposite is true. The more we place ourselves at a disadvantage by our agreements with the Soviets, the more we increase the chances of war. For it must be remembered that the same forces that shed blood in Budapest, Hungary in 1956, in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and in other European nations, is the same enemy that we are dicker with today.

There is one major difference: It will not be quite so simple from now on to just shake our heads when another nation is smothered by the Soviets; it will not be so easy to let the passage of time wipe out the injustice done to free and innocent peoples. For destructive Soviet ICBM's have a U.S.S.R.-to-United States itinerary and the people of the United States are now directly involved. Advice such as that of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler, should be heeded now. An antiballistic missile system must be started now and in dead earnest. The objection of some—Secretary of Defense McNamara is a prime example—that concentration on an ABM system would touch off an expensive arms race is similar to the case of D. Jerome Wiesner and the military parity argument which General Twining mentions in the following article. Some Alice-in-Wonderland argument is concocted, U.S. leadership buys it, the Soviet Union continues on its merry military way, and the people of the United States are left holding the bag. It is high time the American people realize that holding a high office in Government does not guarantee infallibility—the mistakes of high officials in the past easily prove that. The hard-nosed commonsense, always a characteristic of our citizens in the past, must be applied to high-level decisions, just as it is used in the average American home.

With permission, I place the article, "America's Clear and Present Danger," from the Reader's Digest of March 1967, in the Record at this point:

AMERICA'S CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

(An interview with Nathan F. Twining, General, U.S. Air Force (retired))

(NOTE.—In his current book, "Neither Liberty Nor Safety,"* Gen. Nathan F. Twining, who served as chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1957 to 1960, discusses the alternative courses of cold-war strategy open to the United States: (1) to disarm the nation gradually in the hope that communist countries will follow suit; (2) to maintain overwhelming military superiority as a de-

*Published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

terrent to aggression. In an interview with editors of *The Reader's Digest*, General Twining explains why he considers the former course—the one the United States is now pursuing—a blueprint for national suicide.)

Q. General Twining, in your book you express serious misgivings about the present state of U.S. defenses. What has you so worried?

A. During the past few years our ability to deter an enemy attack has been severely eroded. I am convinced that if the present trend is not reversed, and fast, the United States will soon find itself in very serious danger.

Q. Do you mean actual military danger?

A. I do. We have technologically competent enemies who are determined to destroy us. They have been working hard and steadily to advance their military technologies; we have not. The Soviet Union presents the most immediate danger, and clearly is aiming at across-the-board nuclear supremacy. But Red China, too, is rapidly developing an important nuclear capacity.

Q. Won't our ICBM's, our missile-firing submarines and our strategic bombers continue to be an effective deterrent?

A. The force that we have today has done exactly what it was meant to do: it has provided the United States with overwhelming military supremacy through the mid-1960's. But military supremacy is not a permanent fact of life. To keep it, you must keep working at it. If you don't, sooner or later an ambitious enemy is bound to achieve technological breakthroughs which will shift the balance of power in his favor. This, I'm afraid, is what has been happening.

All the major weapons systems now in our combat inventory were started in the 1950's. Since then, we have added nothing significant. We have thrown away more than half a decade of irretrievable lead time in the development of the advanced weapons systems we will need to present a convincing deterrent through the mid-1970's and beyond.

At the same time, we have been discarding existing strength. For example, soon after the 1962 agreement by the U.S.S.R. to withdraw its medium-range ballistic missiles from Cuba, to the amazement of our military professionals and our allies we suddenly announced that all our ballistic missiles in Europe were outmoded and ineffective, and took them out—from Turkey, Italy, and the United Kingdom. The truth is that these weapons were still effective, and by removing them we greatly simplified both the offensive and the defensive problems for the Soviets.

Then we canceled plans to produce a mobile medium-range ballistic missile for NATO Europe, whose vital centers are now within range of hundreds of Soviet medium-range ballistic missiles. We made major reductions in the production of materials for nuclear weapons. We are now engaged in a rapid phase-out of our strategic bombardment force.

Q. What have the Russians been doing in the meantime?

A. Evidence mounts that the Soviets have been pursuing a vigorous weapons program. They have developed a high-yield nuclear-weapons technology, and it seems likely that they can produce warheads of 100 megatons and more. In addition, reliable evidence indicates that they are rapidly deploying an operational anti-ballistic missile system for the defense of vital target areas. There have also been reports that they are increasing substantially the size of their ICBM force.

Q. Do you think that if they achieve breakthroughs in their military technology they will attack?

A. We certainly could look forward to some interesting nuclear blackmail. I think they might attack if they were convinced that they

had achieved a clear strategic ascendancy and could strike with acceptable losses to themselves.

Q. Why have we not been developing our own military technology?

A. Two forces have been at work. One is an anti-nuclear clique of moralists, pacifists and academic dreamers associated at influential levels with the State and Defense departments and the White House. These people may be sincere, concerned and patriotic, but they have never been able to acclimate themselves to the nuclear age. They don't believe that the Soviets mean it when they tell us that someday they will destroy us. They insist that our military supremacy has been "provocative" and largely responsible for the tensions of the past two decades. They theorize that if we scale down our strategic capability to the point where it is equal to or even a little inferior to Russia's, the Soviets will stop competing, the arms race will end and peace will reign.

To my mind, such views are indicative of an inability, or a refusal, to cope with reality. But the anti-nuclear clique is vociferous. It has been a major force in the retardation of our weapons technology and in the weakening of our deterrent.

Q. Who are these anti-nuclear people?

A. The leaders are, mainly, scientists who have been active politically for many years. They advised President Truman not to develop the hydrogen bomb. In fact, there might not have been an American H-bomb if Dr. Edward Teller, a scientist who is in touch with reality, had not presented convincing evidence that we could develop it, and that for national security we must build it. As it turned out, the Soviets tested their first H-bomb within a few months of ours; so it was obvious that they were not guided by any considerations of what the United States might or might not do, but had developed the H-bomb as fast as they could. There is no telling whether this country would still exist if Truman had not decided to proceed with development of this weapon.

Q. Then, in 1958, we joined the Soviets in a moratorium on nuclear testing?

A. That's right. At first we had insisted on a foolproof inspection system—we didn't mind stopping if we knew that no one else was testing and developing. But the Soviets didn't want any sort of inspection. They wanted us to stop our nuclear-weapons program, and to take their word for it that they had stopped theirs. Communist propaganda went to work, and our own antinuclear clique picked up the cry, giving assurances that we were so far ahead in nuclear technology that we would lose little even if the Soviets did test clandestinely.

Every responsible American military leader and our more responsible nuclear scientists, again led by Dr. Teller, opposed a no-inspection moratorium. They insisted that it was a trap, and would end in a double cross. But they were overruled. Of course, the Soviets continued secretly, and in 1961 they ended the "gentlemen's agreement" with a series of tests of great sophistication, technological depth and military significance. We gave them three free years, and they made the most of them.

Q. Did we then re-establish the development capabilities we had when we stopped testing?

A. No. We should have, but we didn't. Gen. Curtis LeMay, then chief of staff of the Air Force, organized a committee of nuclear and military professionals to study the military implications of the Soviet tests. When we finished our study, we went to the White House to recommend urgently that the United States get cracking in exploring the high-yield nuclear-weapons field. But Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who was chief science adviser to President Kennedy, and others did not agree. We were turned down. The underlying conviction of those who opposed

us, it seemed to me, was that the American posture of nuclear supremacy had to be cut back so that "military parity" with the Soviet Union might be achieved.

Even after we learned that the Soviets had made sensational progress with their nuclear-weapons programs, Dr. Hans Bethe, another influential scientist, said he thought that this contributed to stability and reduced Soviet fears of an attack by the United States. I believe most Americans must find such reasoning as upside down as I do.

A year after the Soviets completed their tests, knowing that they had advanced well beyond us with their very-high-yield technology, our government signed a formal nuclear test-ban treaty with them which substantially froze our technology where it stood. Our proposals for on-site inspections were turned down.

Q. Why is it so important to test a high-yield device?

A. Because the Russians have this big weapon, and we do not know what effect it might have on our missile systems. We cannot afford this information gap.

Q. Don't we have an underground testing program?

A. Yes, but you can't measure underground the exact phenomena which might develop from a detonation in the atmosphere or in space.

Q. Has the United States remained ready to resume atmospheric testing immediately, if it should become necessary?

A. It would take a long time—possibly too long—to re-establish a comprehensive testing and development program. It is impossible to keep together, against a day which may or may not come, the kind of scientific talent such a program requires. People disperse. It is unrealistic to think you can stop such a program and then start it up again immediately.

Q. Is the anti-nuclear clique still active in government?

A. Dr. Wiesner recently headed a committee for President Johnson which suggested a total ban on nuclear testing, plus a new concept of flexibility on the matter of mutual inspection, and a total halt in the production of nuclear materials for weapons purposes. In other words, the committee seems to me to say that the United States should quit the nuclear-weapons business altogether and take it on faith that the Soviets will do the same. The plan strikes me as a blueprint for suicide.

But I would not dare predict that we won't implement portions of it. In fact, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg has proposed in the United Nations that the United States would retire vast amounts of nuclear-weapons materials if the Soviet Union would retire about two thirds as much—leaving the Soviets to do with the remaining third whatever they wished. This is an incredible proposal.

Q. Does our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency do a sensible job of planning and negotiating?

A. Many in Congress feel that the 1961 Act which established the agency exceeded the original intent of Congress, which was to provide an arms-control research service for the President. As passed, however, the Act charges the agency with preparing for and managing American participation in international negotiations—even though it is not answerable to Defense or State, and has no overall responsibility for national security. Of course, those who staff this agency want to succeed at what they conceive to be their primary mission—disarmament. Thus, the agency is bound to use its influence on such matters as nuclear testing and development of new weapons—and to lean toward the concept of "no inspection" or "minimum inspection" for the sake of reaching some form of agreement with the communist powers.

The military assigns knowledgeable officers

as advisers to the agency, to try to make sure that the family jewels are not given away. Even so, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be abolished and its functions returned to the departments of Defense and State.

Q. You said that two forces have combined to retard the development of our military capability. One is the anti-nuclear clique. What is the other?

A. The rigid application of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's cost-effectiveness theory to defense planning. Cost-effectiveness is simply a way of measuring the most economical way to accomplish a military mission. I don't quarrel with the theory. But it becomes self-defeating when it is made the dominant factor in defense planning, almost to the exclusion of other vital elements of judgment. Most military professionals believe that this poses a grave danger to the future security of the nation because it stifles research and development. It is usually impossible to produce in advance, from the thresholds of new technologies, conclusive proof that a proposed weapons system will accomplish a mission more effectively and more economically than it could otherwise be done. You must move off the thresholds, conduct serious explorations in promising fields, give some leeway to disciplined imagination. If McNamara's policies had been in effect during the 1950's we would not have the ballistic-missile force we have today.

Q. Don't the senior military officers speak freely to Congress on such matters?

A. No. The Defense Department monitors everything they say, and the officer who talks out of turn may expect some kind of reprisal. I believe strongly in civilian control of the military. But I don't believe that the military posture of the United States is the private business of an autocratic civilian authority, such as the Defense Department has become. When the elected representatives of the people seek professional military judgments, I believe that they are entitled to straightforward answers, and that such answers should be given without fear of reprisal. As the situation now stands, the civilian managers of Defense have effectively silenced the military, and are tightly managing the news that reaches the people.

Q. For a country that isn't doing much to advance its military technology, isn't our defense budget inordinately high?

A. Yes—but primarily because of the war in Vietnam. Any war is extremely expensive—which is another excellent reason for staying militarily strong enough to keep wars from happening.

Q. What must we do? How should we assign priorities?

A. The Defense Department is making our strategic posture a Maginot Line of missiles. If we fail to reverse this trend quickly, the President in some future crisis is going to find himself in a dangerous, inflexible military position. An all-missile strategic force will not give him much choice in the response we can make, since missiles cannot be used for anything short of general nuclear war.

To ensure operational flexibility, we need a mixed force. We need a new manned bomber, one with great range and speed, and the ability to penetrate existing and projected air defenses. Such a bomber, called AMSA (Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft), has already been through the preliminary design stages. It can be built.

Q. What has been holding it up?

A. The Defense Department argues that the need for AMSA is not clear. The military and Congress disagree. Congress keeps appropriating funds and authorizing the Defense Department to proceed. But Defense keeps saying year after year that it is "study-

ing the matter." Millions for study, nothing for hardware.

Q. What else should we be doing?

A. I am deeply concerned at the lack of attention the United States has paid to the really awesome military potential of space. We have done no significant work in developing offensive and defensive space-weapons systems. Yet the Soviets are on record as recognizing and planning for the military utilization of space; in fact, in the past year they have paraded a weapon that they call an orbital bomb. We have been governed in our approach to space by the same absurd and dangerous logic that thwarted development of our nuclear technology. Now, a treaty banning weapons of mass destruction from outer space has been worked up, and high officials of our government are hailing it as a great step toward peace. I'm sure that the Soviets will respect this treaty just as they respect all the agreements they enter into—until it suits their purposes to break it.

Q. In the past, it has taken war or the threat of war to snap America out of peacetime weapons development lethargy. Do you think it will happen this way again?

A. If we keep trying to appease the Soviets with foolish offers and concessions, and keep reducing our military capabilities toward their level, and also keep tying our military technology into unrealistic cost-effectiveness straitjackets, I believe we can look forward to a major crisis. Such a crisis will be far more serious than any we have been through before—certainly more serious than the Cuban missile crisis. Next time, an enemy who no longer can see such a clear strategic superiority on our side may not be inclined to back off so quickly. There would be grave danger of miscalculation. There could be war. I believe that such a crisis is coming. I also believe that such a crisis need not come. But if we are to prevent it, we have no time to lose. The hour is late, and the enemy is watching the clock.

TAX INCENTIVE WOULD HELP MINNESOTA FIGHT AIR, WATER POLLUTION

MR. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MR. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is little question that air and water pollution problems are mounting in Minnesota as well as in other States. The Governor's Committee on Air Resources, reporting on Minnesota air pollution in 1966, labeled air pollution "a problem of statewide concern." The committee reported that at least 356 towns and cities in Minnesota, not including Minneapolis or St. Paul, had one or more sources of air pollution. The committee warned—

The State can expect to encounter more air pollution as it continues to grow in population, productivity and urbanization.

With respect to water pollution, in spite of encouraging efforts, sewage and industrial wastes continue to contaminate the State's waterways. As an example, of a total 849 municipalities in the State on January 1, 1967, some 366 were without sewer systems and another 32 were without any treatment plant, according to the Minnesota Department of

Health. Some 64 additional municipalities have been found by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission to have inadequate treatment plants.

And it should be pointed out that these figures do not indicate the extent of damage to plant and animal life through air and water pollutants associated with industrial plants.

Damage from all kinds of pollution is considerable. While figures on Minnesota exclusively are difficult to come by, it has been estimated that the economic loss to the average individual as a consequence of air pollution alone amounts to at least \$65 per capita per year, or a total of over \$12 billion per year in the United States. The Governor's Committee study in our State last year pointed out—

If the per capita loss in Minnesota were only one-third the national average, or \$22, the annual cost in the State could come to something like \$82.5 million.

Nor should it be assumed that such damage is confined largely to industrial areas. The 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution, for example, estimated that the national agricultural losses resulting from presently recognized air pollutants already amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year. In a State such as Minnesota, concentrations toxic for certain crops may be found as far away as 100 miles from the sources of pollution, according to the Governor's committee.

The problems of air and water pollution, while mounting, are being increasingly recognized by an informed public. A recent Minnesota poll, conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune, reported February 12:

More than three out of four Minnesotans (76 per cent) think pollution of the state's rivers and lakes is a serious problem.

I request inclusion of the entire poll report at this point in my remarks.

SEVENTY-SIX PERCENT: WATER POLLUTION IS SERIOUS PROBLEM

More than three out of four Minnesotans (76 per cent) think pollution of the state's rivers and lakes is a serious problem, according to a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll.

"Water pollution is caused primarily by manufacturers who dump waste materials into the rivers and lakes," said a St. Paul sales manager.

Fifty-three per cent of the state residents interviewed said that business and industry is mainly responsible for the water pollution problem.

President Johnson has asked Congress to appropriate \$306 million to fight water pollution, including nearly \$4 million for projects in Minnesota.

Six hundred adults from all parts of the state were asked:

"Do you think pollution of Minnesota's rivers and lakes is or is not a serious problem?"

The replies:

All adults:	Percent
Is serious problem.....	76
Is not.....	15
Other and no opinion.....	9
Men:	
Is serious problem.....	76
Is not.....	16
Other and no opinion.....	8

Women:	
Is serious problem	77
Is not	14
Other and no opinion	9
Grade school:	
Is serious problem	62
Is not	22
Other and no opinion	16
High school:	
Is serious problem	79
Is not	15
Other and no opinion	6
College:	
Is serious problem	85
Is not	10
Other and no opinion	5

About one out of four people (23 per cent) agree with the Rochester housewife who said, "The carelessness of the public is responsible for pollution—refuse is strewn along the beaches and banks of lakes and rivers."

"Too many communities simply do not have adequate purification systems."

That comment from a St. Louis Park engineer is typical of the responses received from 16 per cent of the public who blame pollution on cities and towns.

"People living along lakes and rivers completely disregard sanitation by dumping untreated waste materials into the water," said a 39-year-old St. Paul man.

The question asked was:

"Who or what do you think is mainly responsible for water pollution?"

The explanation of all respondents:

	Percent
Manufacturers, factories, industry	53
The public, tourists, sportsmen	23
Cities, towns	16
Sewage, drainage from ditches	14
Farmers, fertilizers, insecticides	4
Motorboats, ships	4
Detergents, soaps	3
Other causes	6
No opinion	16
Total	139

The above table totals more than 100 per cent because some people supplied more than one reason for pollution.

Interviews were conducted with a balanced cross-section of adults in early January.

D. C. Townsend, editor and publisher of the Belle Plaine Herald in the Second Congressional District, is among many editors in my congressional district who have expressed themselves on the subject of increased pollution. I ask that a recent editorial by Mr. Townsend be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

In the increasing discussion on water pollution, particularly of the rivers in or near the Twin Cities—The Mississippi, Minnesota and St. Croix—special mention has been made of the condition of the lower Minnesota river. During the past six to ten years, practically every town in the lower Minnesota from Mankato to the mouth of the river financed disposal plants, and that should have greatly reduced the pollution factor. However, the more than twenty miles from Shakopee to the mouth of the river, serving the extensive industrial area on the south, and the vast residential area of Bloomington on the north, creates the charge of bad pollution in the lower Minnesota river. The afflicted areas know it, but are reluctant to spend their own money in correcting the situation as did the towns and industrial plants on our portion of the river.

From such evidence, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent Congress should leave no

stones unturned in doing what is sound, reasonable, and in the public interest in controlling pollution.

I am therefore today introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to liberalize the tax treatment accorded facilities for water and air pollution abatement. Initially sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and a great many other Republicans in the House, it would encourage industry to act promptly in building antipollution facilities by giving a 20-percent tax credit for such investments. The facilities could be expensed as they are built or over a period up to 5 years. Certifying agency for the tax benefit facility would be local authority in compliance with Federal regulation.

This tax incentive would apply to all costs of pollution abatement work, including buildings, improvements, machinery, equipment, and land costs. The project would require approval from the appropriate State authorities, however, in order to qualify.

Mr. Speaker, from the research I have done, it appears at least 148 Minnesota businesses could have been stirred to faster antipollution efforts in the last 2 years alone if liberalized tax treatment had been available as an incentive. My estimate is based on a report issued earlier this year by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission, which indicated at least 148 businesses and corporations had initiated some action to check pollution.

Such businesses would be stimulated to more rapid development of waste control projects if they were assured that such sizable investments undertaken not for profit, but to protect the public interest, could be partially written off through a tax credit.

For such important reasons, I hope the tax incentive legislation so many of us have introduced will receive early and favorable consideration.

BILL INTRODUCED TO ALLOW MINT MARKS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would repeal the prohibition of mint marks on U.S. coinage.

Since the establishment of our coinage system, these marks have been an important part of it, identifying the mint from which our coins were issued. Thus an important part of our historic heritage is preserved in the "CC" mint marks on coinage from the old Carson City, Nev., Mint; it is long since closed, but the "CC" mark remains as a collector's item and a reminder of the prosperous and thriving mint which once existed as our Nation's borders pushed westward.

Mint marks were deleted from our coinage with the enactment of the Coinage Act of 1965. This was an emergency measure, attributed to the critical shortage of coins in circulation at that time. It was felt that coins with no mint marks would be less valuable to collectors, and especially speculators, and would be more likely to stay in circulation where they were desperately needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Treasury Department and Bureau of the Mint officials acknowledge that the coin shortages of 1964 and 1965 have ended; that sufficient coinage is now in circulation to satisfy our Nation's commercial needs. With the end of this shortage, I feel the historically significant mint marks should be restored to our coinage.

Late in the second session of the 89th Congress, a bill was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] to do this. It had the support of literally millions of numismatists, who, incidentally, comprise one of the fastest-growing hobby groups in the Nation. Neither the Bureau of the Mint nor the Treasury Department expressed any opposition to the bill. But, unfortunately, it was lost in the rush for adjournment, as business more vital to the Nation's welfare had to be considered.

Now, as we start a new Congress, I hope this bill will be given thoughtful consideration and eventual passage. Its adoption would end emergency regulations where it has clearly been shown the emergency no longer exists.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session, I introduced House Joint Resolution 39 which would provide for the designation of the second week of each May as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

I introduced a similar measure last year.

The sight of a young man or young woman with his arms outstretched and a safety patrol belt on is a familiar sight to all the Members of this body, I am certain. They should be. There are over 900,000 patrol members in the United States. They serve 40,000 schools in 15,000 communities.

In addition there are some 156,000 patrol members serving in 20 foreign countries.

More than 16 million have served on safety patrols since their establishment in 1922.

When one considers these schoolchildren, who must be from the upper elementary or junior high school grades, protect some 19 million schoolchildren, it is easy to see the tremendous job they are doing.

Some may ask, "What good are these patrols?" The answer can best be given by citing the fact that since 1922, the year the patrols were first instituted, the traffic death rate school-age children has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

Each year, the American Automobile Association joins with the schools and police in sponsoring the National School Safety Patrol Parade here in Washington, D.C. More than 22,000 boys and girls from 20 or more States annually participate in this colorful event.

I am happy that this year there will be a contingent of 12 youngsters from Omaha, Nebr., participating in the parade down Constitution Avenue on May 13. William S. Mitchell will be in charge of the group, which is being sponsored by the Cornhusker Motor Club in Omaha.

In connection with the parade, the American Automobile Association each year presents Gold Lifesaver Medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Among those who have made the presentations in the past are: Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman; Vice Presidents Humphrey and Nixon; and Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

I would like to take this opportunity to invite my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring this legislation, which will call national attention to the wonderful work being done by these youngsters, and I include in my remarks some remarks from the "School Safety Patrol Member's Handbook":

A good school safety patrolman is always on the job. Make your school and schoolmates proud of the way you appear and the way you act on the street.

Dress neatly and cleanly. Keep your patrol belt washed. Wear it correctly.

Be polite. You are a leader. Others will try to act like you.

A good patrol does not stand in the street. Correct patrol position is to stand on the sidewalk, one step back from the curb.

If parked cars block your view, step into the street only far enough to see approaching cars—never more than three steps.

This is what a good patrol member should do:

Stand one step back from the curb, facing the street.

Give the arm-stretched signal for schoolmates to wait back of you on the sidewalk.

Watch for a safe gap in traffic.

Then, step aside, watch for turning cars, motion schoolmates to cross the street and return to your arms-stretched position facing the street.

THE NATIONAL MEDICAL DEVICES STANDARDS COMMISSION ACT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the advances made in medical technology these past few years remind us once again that

we are living in a new age of miracles—miracles of science and medical research. The practice of the medical art has developed to such an extent that the new language and vocabulary sounds like that of the space exploration programs. Words like "automation," "microwave technology," "computerization," "laser rays," "telemetry," and "radiology" are becoming as common to medical doctors as are the "old" words like penicillin, and thermometer, and vitamin.

This is the new language for new events in the new age of better and longer life for our people.

With the explorations of space have come great advances in the science of supporting life in hostile environments. Our astronauts who have walked in space have carried with them an "extravehicular life-support system."

Last year the Nation was awed to learn of Mrs. Esperanza del Valle Vasquez, of Mexico City, who walked out of the Houston Methodist Hospital 2 weeks after an artificial booster device had been linked to her heart by a surgical team under the leadership of Dr. Michael DeBakey.

Artificial limbs, contact lenses, artificial kidneys, surgical implants, nylon arteries, and now artificial hearts—are all becoming an integral part of medical technology and medical practice today.

It is important that as we advance in medical technology and in the development of new medical devices and instrumentation, that there be established some responsible minimum standards for the safety and efficacy of the instruments, devices, and equipment used by today's physician.

Research in these areas of new instruments, medical devices, and artificial limbs and organs is being conducted by private pharmaceutical manufacturers, by private research laboratories, by university medical centers, and by industrial research centers. Much of this work is conducted under Government contract, and under research grants from Federal agencies. The Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are now all involved in encouraging this kind of research.

The varieties of devices and surgical instruments, the specializations of medical technology involved is almost beyond imagination. The amount of knowledge yet to be discovered is staggering. In many cases our understanding of medical technology involved is so limited that we cannot yet set any minimum standards of safety and efficacy.

It is important, nevertheless, that we begin to explore this worthwhile area which so vitally affects the health and welfare of the American people.

It is with these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I am today introducing into the House of Representatives legislation to establish the National Medical Devices Standards Commission.

This national commission will be composed of 20 members equally repre-

sented by five groups of interested parties: First, the private pharmaceutical industry; second, the research laboratories and university medical centers; third, the private practice of medicine; fourth, the public agencies involved in public health, and medical research; and, fifth, the Congress, as custodians of the public interest.

The Commission will study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment. They will determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices. They will advise on such specific manufacturing practices and minimum performance standards as may be recommended to it by the President, the Surgeon General of the United States, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, or competent private medical authorities. They will establish methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards for the research and design, and the manufacture of such medical devices and instruments. The Commission will also establish methods for determining the medical value of devices manufactured and the therapeutic consequences thereof. And, finally, the Commission will recommend to the President and to the Congress feasible methods for Federal regulation of medical devices.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much yet to be learned about this area of medical technology. It is so complex. The specializations of devices are so varied that it would be impossible at this time to set down exacting minimum standards for Federal regulation. What one doctor in a Government agency, or even a panel of doctors in an agency, would determine as a standard of performance could seriously limit and hinder advanced research somewhere in the country.

For the Government to try to keep abreast of all the advances being made in medical instrumentation would require a task force equal to, if not exceeding, the manpower of all the research laboratories, the medical centers, and pharmaceutical manufacturers who are already involved in this area. The bureaucracy thus created would be totally inefficient and unwieldy. It is not necessary to get the job done.

May I quote, Mr. Speaker, from a very fine address given last July 27, 1966, by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Dr. James L. Goddard, before the convention of the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation, in Boston. Dr. Goddard said:

I believe that protective legislation in the medical device and instrumentation field is probably necessary. I believe many of you here this evening would agree with that. And I would, therefore, ask that you not wait for us to put together what has to be ultimately presented before the Congress, but rather that you actively participate in this process. I would have you evaluate some of the problems and anticipate some helpful solutions. This is the way our kind of Government works at its best, with ideas

coming from concerned citizens and framed into law by public servants who listen to and respect the voice of knowledgeable people.

Mr. Speaker, my bill to create the National Medical Devices Standards Commission will carry out Dr. Goddard's invitation. It will bring together the leadership of concerned citizens in this area. It will call forth the voice of knowledgeable people. It will provide the opportunity for the knowledgeable, the concerned, to "actively participate in the process" to putting together the necessary protective legislation in the medical device and instrumentation field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy action by the House on this important legislation affecting the health and welfare of the American people.

VALUES IN COLLEGE FOOTBALL

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the sports world's top honor events each year is the annual banquet of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. At its ninth annual banquet on December 6, 1966, the foundation presented its Gold Medal Award to Col. Earl "Red" Blaik, famous Army and Dartmouth Hall of Fame coach and present chairman of the executive committee of AVCO Corp. The honors dinner reunited Colonel Blaik with one of his great proteges, "lonely end" Bill Carpenter, who recently distinguished himself in battle in Vietnam. In a day when many colleges and universities tend to ignore or play down the values to be derived from good, clean, hard college football competition, I think it worthwhile to call attention to those values as underscored by Colonel Blaik in his Gold Medal acceptance speech at the Hall of Fame banquet. With the unanimous consent of the House, I offer Colonel Blaik's speech for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Colonel Blaik's speech follows:

President LaRoche, Reverend Clergy, members and friends of the Football Foundation:

We are all inspired by the presence of so many legendary football heroes, and as a former coach, I can think of no greater satisfaction than to participate in the honoring of one of my former players. Tonight I have watched with great pride Captain Carpenter, who did the usual both on the playing field and on the battlefield. Bill, your old coach is awed by your distinguished record and I am proud of your example of dedication to the service of our country.

It would be a gross understatement for me to say I am anything less than overwhelmed by the honor the Foundation accords me tonight. I have no illusion that my credentials qualify me to be included with my predecessors. Perhaps I may stand on the statement, though, that during thirty-two years of coaching and eight years of reflection the

respect I hold for the American game of football has never wavered.

One wonders what type of game it is that challenged such distinguished and not forgotten men as Stagg, Yost, Zuppke, Daly, Rockne, Warner, Cavanaugh, Doble, the Joneses—Tad and Howard, McGugin, Alexander, Neyland, Sutherland, Harlow, Caldwell—all of whom I knew well.

THE GAME

It is a game played in some form by over a million young Americans, a game uninhibited by social barriers.

It is a game that in early season requires exhaustive hard work, often to the point of drudgery.

It is a game of violent body contact that demands a personal discipline seldom found in our modern life.

It is a game of team action wherein the individual's reward is that total satisfaction returned by being part of successful team play.

It is a game that is 100% fun when you win, and exacts 100% resolution when you lose.

And if it is the game most like war, it is also the game most like life, for it teaches young men that work, sacrifice, selflessness, competitive drive, perseverance, and respect for authority are the price one pays to achieve goals worthwhile.

It is also a contentious game that has detractors in academic and other circles who enjoy nothing more than the violent verbal impact they bring to a discussion of the sport. I shall only contest the detractors by observing that, imperfect as it may be, college football during the past decades has been deemphasized to the point where it is now, I believe, quite properly emphasized. Today a solid education is the paramount objective of most college players. For my part, just so long as the college does not shortchange the player on his education I do not become overly concerned about either athletic scholarships or recruiting.

In essence, then, based on long observation, it is my conviction the modern approach to the game as compared to that in the years gone by is more forthright, more sensible, and clean. And I suggest we should not now attempt to over-refine the product.

As a coach I gave our squads ten axioms to go by—If you don't mind I shall repeat several of them and relate each to an intimate coaching experience.

RELAXED PLAYER EXCELS

Axiom—A relaxed player performs best and a sense of humor and good fun keeps one relaxed. The squads at Dartmouth and West Point had a lot of fun with their trainer, Rollie Bevan, who was a shrewd judge of young players. Bevan was well attuned to any player who courted the attention of the stands. In a hard-hitting Penn State game a young back went down for the count and was stretched out seemingly seriously injured. A hush came over the crowd and there was a great anxiety in the stands. Now, much to my annoyance, Bevan showed a callous disregard of the injured back and it took considerable prodding on my part before Rollie went onto the field.

This is the scene—Bevan sauntered out to the injured player, but instead of giving the back a whiff of ammonia, Rollie jabbed his toe into the players' side and with each jab, said "Get up, get up, Joe. Get going—the crowd has spotted your number and know it's you. You're their hero and they'll give you a rousing cheer when you jog around."

At that, Joe jumped up and sure enough the relieved crowd gave him a tremendous cheer. By this time our players were convulsed with laughter. Their trainer had demonstrated he was a "Miracle Healer."

Suddenly, it dawned on Joe he had been royally taken. He was infuriated—he steamed over to Bevan and stammered—"D-d-damn you Bevan—you made an ass of me."

SAME DIFFERENCE

Coaches, too, supply humor. I enjoy the story on Francis Schmidt, who was the coach of Ohio State in the '30s. . . . Ohio State was having great trouble with Michigan and Schmidt, a wild man on the bench who really needed a keeper on Saturday afternoons, couldn't stand the Michigan parade through his tackles. After a long gallop Schmidt bellowed, "Look out there, look at Jim, just look at our All America tackle. There he is—knocked flat on his tail." With that, Jim, at the other end of the bench, protested, "No, no coach, I'm not out there, here's old Jim right here on the bench."

With that, Schmidt cocked an eye, measured old Jim and then said, "Now, what's the difference anyway—if you were out there you'd be on your tail." There is much good fun in football and certainly a sense of humor.

GAME OF INCHES

Axiom—Inches make the champion and the champion makes his own luck. In the '46 Army-Navy game, the farewell of Blanchard, Davis and Tucker to Army football, the first half looked like an Army route of Navy. For the rest of the game, this cadet team, undefeated in three years, fought the fiercest rear guard action I have ever seen on a football field. Finally, with the score 21-18, the Cadets stopped the Middles twice on the 3 yard line and once on the 4 as the game ended in a scene of pandemonium. Picture this if you will: A half crazed crowd had come out of the stands and pressed against the sidelines obliterating my last minute view of the playing field. I was more isolated than the Lonely End as my frantic calls to the spotters—Gustafson and Hickman—went unanswered. I later learned that Andy presented a ghostly belligerent stare toward the playing field while Herman, bless his soul, buried his head and pleaded, "Please, God, don't let them do it—don't let them do it." By all odds this was the most starkly anxious moment of my coaching career. But the Blanchard-Davis Army team prevailed—Inches made them champions and they made their own luck.

PRICELESS LEADER

Axiom—Good fellows are a dime a dozen, but an aggressive leader is priceless. The 1955 season was most trying for me as we had a lean squad and no quarterback. A coach has never known trouble unless he has the senseless temerity to change an All American End into a "T" quarterback in one season. There was hardly an officer or cadet at West Point who didn't believe this switch was a colossal error. Even my friends of the Press called the move "Blaik's Folly."

Sunday afternoon after the Michigan defeat the Superintendent, my former football teammate, came to my office and inquired as to whether I was aware of the local sentiment about our quarterback. I told him that the team was aware, the staff was aware, and I was aware, but far more important they all believed as I did that our only chance to defeat the Navy was with Hollender at quarterback.

A few minutes after the Superintendent left Hollender came to see me. As he entered the office I got up, placed my hand on his shoulder, and said, "Holly, you played a good game yesterday and I am proud of you. You're making fine progress as our quarterback." With moisture in his eyes, Holly replied, "I know what the cadets are saying, I have heard the officers talk, and I came fully prepared to get my old number back,

but I want you to know I prayed all the way here that you would not give up on me."

THE LONG WALK

Now, it is many weeks later. It is the night before the Navy game. As was usual, I took the squad for a bedtime walk on the golf course which ended with a few words about the big game. I recall saying: "Three times this season I took the long walk across muddy fields to congratulate first Benny Oosterbaan, then Ben Schwartzwalder, and then Jordan Olivar. It has been a trying season and I am a bit weary from those walks. Tomorrow before 100,000 spectators and fifty million television viewers I want you men to know it would be the longest walk of my coaching career if I cross the field to congratulate the Navy coach."

There was silence for a moment—then a voice spoke out with resolution. It was Holleder. "Colonel, you're not taking that walk tomorrow."

The Cadets won an upset victory over the Navy. The Press stated it was Holly's vindication. It wasn't—it wasn't at all. It was an unforgettable demonstration that an aggressive leader is priceless.

VALUES OF FOOTBALL

From these remarks you may have sensed I have fixed opinions on the value of the American game of football. I have, and in summary, simply stated, they are three:

One: Football should be secondary to the purpose for which the player is in college.

Two: Championship football and good scholarship are entirely compatible. We salute our scholar athletes tonight as splendid examples of this fact.

Lastly: The purpose of the game of football is to win and to dilute the will to win is to destroy the purpose of the game.

This, then, gentlemen, has been my football creed and I dare say with the active support and influence of this great Foundation college football will not be devalued by the passing of time.

May I repeat, it is an overwhelming honor to have received the Gold Medal Award from the National Football Foundation. I am grateful to the Foundation and to you friends of Football, but more especially I am grateful to my former Dartmouth and Army players and to my old coaching associates, many of whom have come far to be with us tonight.

It is to each one of you then, I give my hearty thanks, my warm thanks, for this inspiring and memorable evening.

Thank you.

TO GUARANTEE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights proposals which the President has submitted to Congress are essentially familiar ones. In its broad outlines and many of its specific provisions, this year's administration bill is very similar to that which was debated, modified, and ultimately passed by the House last year.

There is, however, one significant exception. The administration, unfortunately, did not see fit to include in this

year's draft legislation any form of preventive relief to preclude interference with freedom of speech, assembly, or petition in relation to civil rights. I am today introducing a bill fill this gap.

The bill which I am offering today is identical to title III of H.R. 14765, the civil rights bill of 1966, as reported on June 30, 1966, by the House Judiciary Committee. This title would provide an avenue of injunctive relief, through civil action, in two types of instances:

First. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deprive another of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws on account of such person's race, color, religion, or national origin; and

Second. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deny or hinder another in the exercise of his lawful right to speak, assemble, petition, or otherwise express himself for the purpose of securing recognition of or protection for equal enjoyment of guaranteed and protected rights free from discrimination.

In such instances, the bill would authorize a person, or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, to institute a civil action or other proceeding in the U.S. district courts for temporary or permanent preventive relief, including restraining orders or injunctions.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is in accord with a line of legislative proposals which have been discussed on both sides of the Capitol for a full decade. As part III, this approach was offered during the Eisenhower administration and was passed by the House in 1957. As title III, it was debated during our consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As the Lindsay amendment, it was offered during floor debate on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Again as title III, this proposal was introduced early last year by approximately 20 Members of the House, accepted by Judiciary Committee as an addition to H.R. 14765, and passed by the House as an important part of that omnibus bill.

In advancing this proposal, the committee and the House have recognized its importance as a complement to the Federal criminal laws which punish violations of civil rights. Title III would give every American the assurance that he has a course of action to prevent such violations, and to guarantee that he may exercise his first amendment rights in advocating equal rights free from violence, intimidation, interference, or the threat of interference. This bill would also give our law enforcement officers a new tool with which to prevent violence, protect American citizens, and maintain civil order.

I trust that the House Judiciary Committee, in considering the administration's civil rights package of 1967, will continue the precedent set in 1966 and

will again seek to improve our legislative guarantees of equal rights by reporting title III.

FATE OF POWELL TO BE DECIDED BY HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday we will be called upon to decide the fate of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. There is no question but what POWELL misused public funds and has acted in a grossly irresponsible manner. The facts of the Powell case have been carefully developed by a special House committee, and that committee has recommended severe punishment.

The American press has thrust the Powell case into the forefront of America's attention. Before POWELL came the strange case of Bobby Baker, and the allegations and investigation of U.S. Senator THOMAS DODD. All of this has culminated in a deep suspicion by the American people of their elected representatives.

I firmly believe that the great majority of Congressmen and Senators are honest and of the highest integrity. But the fact remains that the actions of a few have cast doubt on the entire legislative branch of our Government. If we punish ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—and go no further—we have done little to repair the sagging reputation of Congress. It is my sincere hope that the Powell investigation will culminate in the establishment of a Standing Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee must have the power to investigate charges of official misconduct against any Member of the House of Representatives, and must have the authority to recommend corrective measures to the House concerning that Member. Only through such a committee can we begin to repair the reputation of the House of Representatives.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKENS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and

bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally. Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to, first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, held by them, their spouses, or any staff members making more than \$15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest, either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government; and fourth, make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional payrolls.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this kind of "gesture of honorability" is desperately required at this time in our history.

The "credibility gap"—with regard to the conduct of Congressmen, has not grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue—it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of leftwing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime in the streets—to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as Govern-

ment grows, the identity and majesty of the individual citizen shrinks.

This terrible truth, and the urge to temper it, was at the root of the Administrative Procedure Act adopted by the Congress in 1946.

In the two decades which have elapsed since then, Government has grown in size and power more than ever before in a similar period. The time has come to make adjustments, take up the slack and elevate the citizen's posture to defend his rights in conflicts with Government. It is time to modernize the Administrative Procedure Act. This is the purpose of the bill I have introduced today.

There are many reasons for the dramatic increase in citizen-Government conflicts. Growth in the private sector has complicated life and compounded frictions; in the last 20 years the gross national product has tripled. Scientific and technological changes have brought a new sophistication to old disputes. In 1946, atomic energy, television and electronics were in their infancy. The communications and transportation industries were on a threshold no one fully appreciated. Space exploration was only dreamed of.

Those who wrote the original law in 1946 hardly anticipated demographic developments this generation of Americans has witnessed. Better fuel, food, clothing, shelter, and medicine have prolonged the life-expectancy, and with the help of greater immigration, America's population has increased by 45 million. Population is not only greater but it has become increasingly concentrated in urban pockets. These developments have created new problems, new needs, new attitudes which in turn have created new programs, laws, licenses, regulations, and controls.

As a consequence of these changes and developments, the likelihood of a citizen confrontation with some arm of the many arms of Government is infinitely greater today than it was 20 years ago. Moreover, the substance of the conflict is more complicated and, in terms of both property and personal liberty, the results of the conflict are more consequential. In such circumstances, the citizen's only protection is in stronger procedural safeguards. To quote Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

The history of liberty has largely been the history of procedural safeguards.

Under our Constitution, the people of the United States are regarded as citizens rather than subjects. As such, they are entitled to deal with the agencies of Government on a parity. The purpose of my bill is to restore a proper citizen-Government balance by insuring that agency procedures governing the settlement of disputes are not weighted against the citizen.

In pursuance of that purpose, my bill will guarantee that interested citizens who may be affected by agency rules and regulations will have an effective voice in the formulation of those rules and regulations.

These rules, including those which govern practice before the agency, and subsequent modifications or interpretations of these rules should be fully publicized.

For the sake of the citizen, rules concerning investigations, hearings, evidence, and decisions should be clear and constant and should guarantee every element of due process.

The practice of depositions and discovery and the prehearing conference procedure which have been used so successfully in the Federal district courts to narrow the issues and expedite the trial, must be adapted to adversary proceedings before administrative and regulatory agencies so far as practicable.

The citizen should have the unrestricted right to use subpoenas and to demand declaratory orders.

In the field of administrative appeals, the citizen's rights should be broadened and a new system of interlocutory appeals should be inaugurated to reduce the number of final appeals that otherwise would have to be made to the agency level.

In the field of court appeals, the citizen should be guaranteed recourse to the Federal district courts except where there is specific statutory provision for appeal to another Federal court. Venue in such appeals should be patterned after that fixed in title 28 United States Code 1391 enacted in 1962 so that the citizen will not be required to come to Washington but rather will be allowed to file his complaint in the Federal district court where he resides or has his principal place of business, or where the agency proceeding took place, or where any real property involved in the proceeding is situated.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to commend the gentleman for his introduction of legislation to update the Administrative Procedure Act. I know of the gentleman's interest in this field. It is an interest of many years' duration. In 1962, the gentleman was the author of the venue statute to which he has just referred. He fought hard and successfully to allow citizens having causes of actions against Government agencies to sue the Government at home, in their own districts. He proposes now to extend that principle to administrative appeals.

The gentleman's observation about the increasing complexity of the Government and the decreasing status of the individual citizen in it certainly is well put and well taken.

The gentleman from Virginia is one of those individuals who does not merely decry the increasing complexity and power of government; he is a Member of Congress who proposes to do something about it.

The bill the gentleman is introducing today is evidence of the fact that the

gentleman from Virginia is a "doer" rather than a talker. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. I most sincerely appreciate the generosity of the gentleman's remarks. So long as he continues in the same vein I shall be glad to yield to him the remainder of the time which has been made available to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a broad-brush picture of the provisions and purposes of the legislation I introduced today. Similar legislation passed the other body in the last Congress. It is my hope that the House will take the lead this year and register its urgent concern for citizen protection in this vital area.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS— PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 6098

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight on Monday next to file a report and supplemental views to accompany H.R. 6098, the interest equalization tax bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], which I believe is for 10 minutes and which was to follow mine, precede my special order of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NONPROLIFERATION TREATY—A NUCLEAR YALTA?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in negotiating the nonproliferation treaty the Johnson administration trustfully looks ahead to a rosy era in which promises are kept, nuclear spread is stopped, U.S. security is enhanced and so on ad infinitum or nauseam, as the case may be. Humbug. Why the apparent Soviet shift from negative to positive on this treaty? I say "apparent" because they have wanted it all along, craftily figured the way to get it was seemingly to be forced, and are now laughing up their sleeves. The long negotiations gave them a forum to spew out venomous propaganda against the United States, West Germany, and others. It gave their atomic scientists several years to turn into lethal hardware knowledge gained before the test ban, in 1962, for 40 tests in and above the atmosphere. They multiplied their ICBM's and deployed a nuclear-tipped ABM system. The same

years were those of ever intensifying U.S. involvement in Vietnam. As the administration's peace image tarnished, with wily contumacy the Soviets fanned in it an almost hysterical yen to consummate tarnish-removing treaties. The Soviets watched as they might watch a dog drool for a bone. By a negotiating striptease—peeling off small concessions and hints—they sharpened the Johnson administration's treaty desires while they themselves moved closer to the bone. Why? What, in addition to that already related, does the view of this treaty from the Kremlin offer them that we do not see? The answer is several sided.

A prime Soviet objective since NATO was formed in the late 1940's has been to weaken it and then dispose of it and all other free world alliances. Unquestionably the course of negotiations has reinforced European misgivings over whether, when the chips are down, the United States itself will come to NATO's nuclear defense. At the same time it sees the United States gasping for a treaty which simultaneously will ban Europe from developing atomic defenses on its own and bar the United States from selling nuclear weapons to it for Europe's independent self-defense against Soviet aggression. Is this a nuclear Yalta? Actions speak louder than words and despite Johnson-Rusk-McNamara reassurances Europeans increasingly weigh the advantages of turning from Washington and making their own accommodation with Moscow's desire for world dominance. The seeming "togetherness" of the United States with the U.S.S.R. on this treaty can almost, by them, be taken as precedent. Recently in London Premier Kosygin told newsmen that "whether the Federal Republic of Germany likes it or not, the document must be signed." Almost contemporaneously—to gain West German adherence—head-shrinking treatments were given to Foreign Minister Willy Brandt by President Johnson in Washington and to Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger by Soviet Ambassador Semyon Tsarapkin in Bonn.

Another prime Soviet objective is to get rid of the U.S. strategic deterrent. The Soviets deployed a damage-limiting ABM system while we negotiated. This affects the credibility of our deterrent when considered in parallel with McNamara's unwillingness to go for a U.S. ABM system and his refusal to replace the aging SAC bomber fleet. Of greater significance from the Soviet viewpoint, however, is what they may consider a "technology and treaty" approach to ending the deterrent. They may believe, and induce others to believe, that the delays and limitations of underground testing, together with their extensive 1962 test effort, compared with our modest effort, have given them a substantial lead in nuclear technology. Their ABM deployment and the absence of ours could be an argument to this point. They also see, perhaps have participated in, the buildup of pressures for a treaty banning even underground tests which could allow the United States to

catch up. The Johnson administration shows every willingness to negotiate it either as a condition of the nonproliferation treaty or a quick follow-on to it. If, indeed, the Soviets have gained nuclear superiority, and before admitting it can maneuver an underground ban to freeze their superiority into permanent being, the U.S. deterrent will vanish. The ball game will be over.

SPECIAL ETHICS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this special order, I would like to ask unanimous consent for all Members to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on this subject for a period of 5 legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today so that a number of our new Republican Members of the 90th Congress can address ourselves to the tremendously important subject of ethical behavior in the House of Representatives.

First, I want to make very clear that all of us support the active leadership role taken in this important area by our distinguished minority leader and by the Policy Committee. Both have made forceful appeals for a special ethics committee. I hope what we do here will enforce and back up the forthright position that they have taken on this important subject.

Today I have introduced a House resolution (H. Res. 279) creating a select ethics committee and establishing rigid requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities; disclosure of relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists; and also establishing full disclosure of certain nepotie relationships.

Many of my colleagues are joining today in introducing similar or identical resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves is really a very basic and simple one: Does a Congressman have the right to behave as he pleases—or does he have an obligation to the Congress and to the country to observe certain standards of conduct?

Well, the Republican answer to that is very clear. We feel we most definitely do have an obligation. Like Caesar's wife, every Member of this House must be above suspicion. And if that means a self-imposed code of conduct, so be it.

A problem exists; we must face up to it. We have a responsibility; we must live up to it.

This is not a matter of exposing our weaknesses; rather we should look on this as an opportunity to demonstrate our strengths.

James Reston wrote in the New York Times yesterday, February 26, in a col-

umn devoted to corruption in America, that—

The habit of honesty in the U.S.—in its people and in its institutions—is still too strong to be overwhelmed.

That is why it is so important that we take the initiative. We must make the moves that will lead to a practical code of conduct, because if we do not, if we keep putting it off, we shall be answerable for any misconduct to an aroused and angry America with that "habit of honesty that is too strong to be overwhelmed."

It is important that we now use our energies to find ways of preventing misconduct, not waste our energies figuring out ways to punish it. We are being watched. And if anyone doubts it, he will find out soon enough if the House tries to pretend that the issue of congressional ethics is not a matter of real concern to every American. We cannot put this matter aside again. This time we must do something. It is too late to do nothing.

My resolution calls for the creation of a special Ethics Committee. It goes further. It would make all Members disclose their principal assets and liabilities, their sources of income, their relationships with businesses which are beholden to the Federal Government for their right to do business. In addition it calls for a full disclosure of relatives on the payroll, and it requires the spelling out of any relationship financial or personal, with any lobbyist.

I know that some will feel this is an invasion of privacy or that by inference it suggests that many Members of the House have something to hide. This criticism misses the point.

No one is anxious to lay out for public scrutiny his personal financial affairs, but regrettably it must be done. For rightly or wrongly, until we act and act with force, the country is going to hold us in suspicion. I would add right here that these disclosure provisions should also apply to candidates for the Congress as well as Members. This must be covered by legislation which we should promptly enact.

Some people say, "Oh, this disclosure stuff is old hat." I say that it is not old—it has never been tried.

I have been impressed by the seriousness of purpose of the Republican leadership in this broad area. It is the purpose today of the new Members to add our voices to the battle. True, we lack experience in the House, but we bring to this problem a fresh look. We feel totally uninhibited by tradition in this one sensitive area, because we think we heard the unmistakable clear voice of the people saying on November 8, "Go there and do something to restore respect for the House."

We like the concept of a special Ethics Committee and many of us like the idea of doing more. We must demonstrate to the American people that we have nothing to hide. To so demonstrate we must bend over backward as far as our own personal disclosures go; but if these disclosures remove the doubt that is trou-

bling many Americans about their Congress, then it will have been worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently call on the leadership of this House to give us some action in this important area.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say we do not come to this floor today leveling any charges at any Member or group. We come here having taken a fresh look at the problem; we come here feeling we do know the will of the people on this important issue; we come here with a constructive spirit and with open minds; we come here restless with the status quo and eager to try.

We come here determined to be a part of the first Congress in history that has actually been willing to come to grips—forcefully and specifically—with this very touchy and difficult subject. This time we must do something—it is too late to do nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to any of my colleagues who desire to participate in this colloquy.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for the stand which he has taken today on the commencement of this particular action. However, I would like to add these few words:

This is a statement which has been signed so far by 43 Members of the new freshman Republican group:

We newly elected Republican Congressmen feel certain that the Congress of the United States—possibly with a few rare exceptions—is composed of men and women who are honest, dedicated and prepared both to preach and to practice adherence to a code of high personal morality and conduct.

We feel strongly that no duly elected individual member of Congress should be singled out from our midst to be judged against any special standard against which we are not all ready and willing to be judged.

In an effort to cause these feelings to take solid form, a number of us have earlier in this session introduced, or are today introducing or supporting, bills and resolutions looking to these goals.

In order to demonstrate to the people of the United States in a clear and convincing manner the fact that these feelings are not ours alone but are also the feelings of the entire Congress, we urge the entire Congress, and particularly the Members thereof sitting in positions of leadership in this Congress as Members of the majority Democratic party, to insist upon immediate study of and action upon proposed changes in House Rules and in statutes that will incorporate these feelings as part of such rules and statutes. We intend to push as hard as we are able toward the earliest possible attainment of these goals.

Done this 27th day of February, 1967 in Washington, D.C. by:

SHERMAN P. LLOYD, JOHN PAUL HAMMER-SCHMIDT, GUY VANDER JAGT, CHARLES E. WIGGINS, DANIEL E. BUTTON, WILLIAM V. ROTH, WILLIAM O. COWGER, GEORGE BUSH, THOMAS S. KLEPPE, DAN KUKENDALL, JAMES C. GARDNER, MARGARET M. HECKLER, DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., CLARENCE E. MILLER, HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, JOHN M. ZWACH, LOUIS C. WYMAN, M. G. SNYDER, HOWARD W. POLLOCK, SAM STEIGER, WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JOHN DELLENBACK, GARRY BROWN, J. HERBERT BURKE, THOMAS J. MESKILL, CHALMERS P. WYLLIE, WILEY MAYNE, CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR., WILLIAM A. STEIGER, FLETCHER THOMPSON, JOHN E. HUNT, GILBERT GUDE, LARRY WINN, JR., ROGER H. ZION, EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, JAMES A. MCCLURE, JAMES V. SMITH, EDWARD G. BIESTER, DONALD E. LUKENS, ROBERT D. PRICE, WILLIAM L. SCOTT, ROBERT V. DENNEY, PHILIP E. RUPPE, TOM RAILSBACK.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oregon and I commend the gentleman for his forthright approach to this subject.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as distasteful as it may be, it is an irrefutable fact of life that the elected official is regarded by those who elect him as capable of the most flagrant dishonor. Having most recently joined the ranks of this distinguished body, we of the freshman class are possibly even more cognizant of this fact than our more senior colleagues. It is my intention, and I am certain the will of my fellow freshmen, that the code of ethics herein proposed makes it patently clear that defections of honor are totally rejected as a way of congressional life. I urge the adoption of this code, as well as an Election Reform Act which I am today introducing, not as an admission that wholesale chicanery will run rampant without it, but that our behavior will not be modified by its implementation. That the practices spelled out in the code are in keeping with our present conduct.

There will always be those among us, on both sides of the aisle, who will succumb to avarice; the code will not prevent this. The code will make the apprehension of the guilty more accessible; it will, most important of all, make the innocence of the vast majority of the membership of this body abundantly discernible.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to commend the gentleman from Texas on his presentation of this much-discussed subject. At this point in the proceedings, I want to go on record as being in favor of part I, which covers the establishment of a Select Committee of the House on Standards and Conduct. This is in accordance with the Republican policy committee recommendation, and I agree with it. We presently have a code of ethics in the House which was passed on July 11, 1958, and which sets forth 10 points to which any person in Government service should adhere. I would suggest to the select committee so recommended by this resolution to carefully review these 10 points and to consider proper ways and means of enforcing them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert these 10 points at this point in the RECORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

The 10 points referred to are as follows:

I. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

II. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.

III. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving to the performance of his duties his earnest effort and best thought.

IV. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

V. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his governmental duties.

VI. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

VII. Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his governmental duties.

VIII. Never use any information coming to him confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means for making private profit.

IX. Expose corruption wherever discovered.

X. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

Mr. BUSH. I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Texas in urging support for the ethics and disclosure bill and to reiterate its importance to the House and to the Nation. We are all cognizant of the fact that each and every Member of Congress is presently governed by a written code of ethics which was adopted on July 11, 1958. Although I sincerely feel that even this code is really unnecessary to establish a standard of conduct for the vast majority of our Members, I am proud that we have one. At any rate, under the existing code of conduct, the Members of Congress are governed mostly by their own conscience since there is no permanent organization or structure to investigate complaints or

recommend disciplinary action by the Congress.

Instances where it was necessary for congressional action to discipline a Member for unethical conduct have indeed been rare. Yet we know that these possibilities are real and I can think of no better way to provide for these possibilities than the ethics and disclosure bill which establishes a Select Committee of the House on Standards and Conduct. This committee will operate strictly on a nonpartisan basis and its work will be geared to enhance and strengthen the standards of conduct of the Members of the House.

We all know that the general public's opinion of the ethics of Members of Congress is not too high compared to the other professions, and their opinion is particularly low right now. This resolution is an excellent opportunity for us to demonstrate and proclaim to the public that we are opposed to unethical practices in any shape or form, and we are prepared to do something to guard against violations of our standards of conduct by establishing a committee for this purpose. We should be willing to judge our own Members and ready and able to deal with violations of our code with measures as harsh as necessary. The other provisions of the resolution providing for full disclosure strengthen our position that we are operating above board with nothing to hide and this is the way it should be.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for those pertinent comments.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL].

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been a Member of this House for so short a time, I would ordinarily be reticent about urging reforms in the procedures of the House. The rules, traditions, and operations of the House have been evolved over the years. Generations of able minds have developed them in response to particular situations and in the quest for orderly, truly representative government. One does not lightly propose changes in a system which has brought just government to more free citizens than any other in history.

But what is proposed today by my colleagues and myself also follows years of tradition—bad tradition. From the beginning, scandals involving various Members of Congress have marred the public image of the legislative branch. Their cumulative effect has been to undermine public trust in our democratic institutions. Recent allegations of misdeeds by Members and employees have shocked the Nation. Three of the major cases are very much with us today. One of them, arising in this body, is moving to a partial solution, at least, by the House on Wednesday. Another, involving an employee of the other body, has resulted in court convictions which are now on appeal. The third involves a Member of the other body from my own State.

In addition, we can read almost daily in the press vague references to other

misdeeds. The public demands and is entitled to reform. My bill, House Resolution 166, and the others of my colleagues, are designed to provide not only a strict, fair code of ethics for the Congress but also the machinery for enforcing it. Until this is done, a cloud of moral suspicion will continue to hang corrosively over this Capitol. Let us act now to drive it away.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments.

I would like to add, though, that I am sure all of us as new Members feel the concern that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL] expressed in his opening comments, but I would also add that perhaps we can take a new and fresh look at this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his forthright statement.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER].

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on the day Congress convened in January, my first day as a Member of the National House, I favored adoption of a code of ethics for Members of Congress. I believed strongly then, and believe strongly now, that such a code should be adopted.

A law setting forth a code of ethics has been enacted for members of the Massachusetts Legislature and are laws in the books in other States. In my judgment, there certainly should be an effective code of ethics for Members of Congress, the highest lawmaking body in the Nation. Congress not only should do this but we have a duty and responsibility to do it.

The fortune—or misfortune—of one Member of Congress is but a shadow of the problem. Its substance, and the larger issue, is the conduct—or misconduct—of Congress itself.

A resolution of the hard problem posed by the gentleman from New York will be worse than meaningless if it is not accompanied by reforms of wider application.

To seat, to censure, and to fine a duly elected Representative for abuse of his public trust without imposing equal demands and expectations on his colleagues, would lend credence to the charge of hypocrisy which the censured Member has already flung at these Chambers.

How can the House content itself with chastising one Member for violation of an ethical code yet to be explicitly defined for all Members?

How can the House, in conscience, settle the accounts of one Member without settling the accountability of all Members?

How can the House slap one Member's wrist without holding out all Members' hands for inspection?

If the Congress does not ask itself these questions, the people will ask them.

Only the rapid development of a congressional code of ethics and its continuing enforcement by a standing committee from both Houses, will deny the

gentleman from New York the martyr's robes. And, more importantly, only such a code and such a committee will insure the continued confidence in the Congress of our citizenry.

The country waits for Congress. Let us not keep them waiting.

For these reasons I maintain that the Congress must enact a strict, effective, and fair code of ethics now.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and certain material in tabular form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH], in introducing and discussing a subject that deeply concerns the people of this country and this Congress—ethics and standards.

We discuss today the ethics in this and the other Chamber and in our election process. This is a subject that deserves more discussion and attention. It is a subject that we must concern ourselves with if we are to continue to have a workable relationship as Members of Congress with those who have elected us.

The strength of our Government, of our federal system as we know it today, depends on the strength of our American system of elections as well as the faith the governed hold in those who govern. Our activity, in the past, in the future and now, will dictate our constituents' faith in our ability to serve.

It is primarily, Mr. Speaker, through the exercise of the franchise to vote that American citizens participate in self-government. It is, therefore, vitally important that we, as their duly elected representatives in this Congress, keep our constituents informed of our actions and purposes and that we leave no doubt in their minds as to the purpose of any actions.

I have joined today with a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to establish the procedure for Members of Congress, their spouses, and their assistants to disclose publicly their income and financial assets and liabilities. Both the resolution and the bill I have introduced will accomplish this important task. In keeping with the intent of this legislation, I have today placed on public file with the Clerk of the House a statement of my financial holdings.

The bill establishing the Election Reform Act of 1967 which I have introduced today will also take an important step toward filling another glaring weakness in our present system. The Election Reform Act of 1967 will close the holes in our present law, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. It will make

sweeping changes in the reporting by candidates of expenditures for their campaign and the contributions they receive. In effect, it will create a reporting system where now we have none.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion magazine, in August of 1966, did an excellent job of outlining some of the problems now in existence with regard to the Corrupt Practices Act. The magazine said in part:

The costs of campaigning in the United States have skyrocketed in recent years, and no end is in sight. In 1912, the Democrats reported spending \$1,134,848 to elect Woodrow Wilson President, but in 1964 it cost the Republicans 17 times as much—\$19,314,796—to run Barry Goldwater's unsuccessful campaign for the Presidency. In 1948, the total reported national-level expenditures of the political parties was \$8,771,879. In 1964, the total had soared to \$47,762,890.

It's been estimated that the real, total national bill for political campaigns in 1964, from the Presidency down to town government, was in the neighborhood of \$200 million—up from \$140 million in 1952. In 1962, when the Presidency wasn't even at stake, about \$100 million—or about \$2 for each of the 53 million Americans who went to the polls—was spent on races for Congress, state and local government.

Mr. Speaker, it has become the procedure, unhappily, for both political parties to raise the substantial amounts needed for political campaigns from large contributors. My bill is designed to severely restrict this practice and encourage small contributions of up to \$100.

A November 18, 1966, editorial of the Sheboygan Press in Sheboygan, Wis., provides a good discussion of the difficult situation surrounding the soaring cost of political activities. I include that editorial at this point as part of my remarks:

POLITICAL EXPENSES

Three members of the Senate bowed out when the 89th Congress adjourned. Senators Neuberger of Oregon, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and Simpson of Wyoming were not seeking re-election.

Saltonstall and Simpson may deliver themselves of some reflections, in due course, on their experiences in Washington. Mrs. Neuberger already has uttered some sharp words that merits some attention. She went out with a penetrating and disturbing comment on her impressions of being a senator, specifically on the expense of maintaining membership in that august body.

"Everything comes back to money," she said. "It's the one with the most money who will win. It is a thwarting of what we call the great democracy." It seems so, indeed, when measured against what is spent on many a Senate election. She said her 1960 campaign cost \$80,000 and termed it "cheap" compared to the \$2 million required in an Illinois senatorial election. Expenses in the larger states of New York and California reportedly are even higher.

These observations by a retiring Senator are rather thought provoking. Mrs. Neuberger stands little to gain by making them, and perhaps could generate a touch of enmity with her former colleagues. The Congress in its recent session passed an imperfect bill granting the principal political parties certain funds contributed by willing taxpayers. The Neuberger remarks indicate that once a workable formula is achieved for presidential elections, as the new legislation provides, efforts should be made to extend the system to lesser offices.

In order to help overcome part of this problem, Mr. Speaker, the last Congress passed a \$1-per-person tax checkoff plan. I think the law is a poor one and include as part of my remarks two excellent editorials from newspapers in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, regarding this matter:

[From the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter]

DANGERS ARE APPARENT

Last year the Congress passed a \$1-per-person tax checkoff plan for presidential campaign contributions. The foolish decision of Congress represents an extremely dangerous grant of power the heads of the national political parties.

It is estimated that each party will receive approximately \$30 million.

Offhand—it is possible to ask why the Internal Revenue Service should serve as a collection agency for partisan politics.

President Johnson signed the "Christmas Tree" bill with a statement saying "presidential candidates will no longer have to rely on special interest groups to meet the heavy financial burden of a campaign." Most everyone still has Bobby Baker in mind.

It is difficult to understand why partisan presidential campaigns should be sponsored by the public. There is nothing wrong if an individual wants to send a dollar to the Democrats or the Republicans, but it certainly should not be deducted from his income tax payments, and, the overburdened Internal Revenue Service should not be saddled with the task of making the deductions.

The trouble with the whole idea is that it places too much money without any restraints in the hands of political organizations.

Robert F. Kennedy, New York Democratic Senator, sort of hit the proverbial nail on the head when he said:

"Say you were my friend here in the City of New York and I was head of the Democratic Party. I'd say to you, Here's \$500,000, I hope you can work for the candidate in 1968. . . . And if you have a struggle for the nomination you know that the money is going to go to the national committee. . . . He can easily indicate to various parts of the country that they will receive large amounts of money if they vote in a way that meets his wishes."

There is extremely serious danger when Congress attempts to intertwine tax collections and methods with partisan and sometimes corrupt politics.

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent]

HOW NOT TO FINANCE CAMPAIGNS

There has been a growing concern among many politicians and thoughtful voters that the ever-rising costs of campaigning make political office unattainable for some and unpalatable for others. But one way not to remedy the situation is the tax credit amendment hurriedly tacked on to the tax bill passed by the United States Senate in its closing moments Saturday.

The provision, put into the bill by Senator Long, aims at helping to finance presidential campaigns. A box on individual income tax returns may be checked by taxpayers beginning in 1968 if they wish to contribute \$1 to a presidential campaign fund and have \$1 deducted from their tax. Couples filing joint returns may contribute and deduct \$2. The major political parties, every four years, would then split the money subject to limitations on the number of votes cast in the preceding presidential election. A minor party could get a share only by polling five million votes in the preceding election. According to the formula, the Democratic and Republican parties would each get \$35 million for 1968.

The overwhelming victories of Democratic

candidates have alarmed even some non-Republicans that our two party system itself is in peril. The tax credit would aim somewhat at reducing this danger. As far as a valid deductible expense for every taxpayer interested in maintaining the two party system, the credit is probably sound.

But it overlooks every taxpayer's right to support the party of his choice. In order to get a tax credit—and a very minor one—he must financially support both parties. And somehow it does not seem likely that either presidential candidate of the two major parties is in such dire need. The money is needed far more down the line where neither \$1,000 President's Clubs nor massive union and fat cat support generally lie. And while there is always some danger of too much power in elections being in the hands of minor parties such as may be once more happening in the New York gubernatorial race this fall, a tax credit going only to the major parties in the form of a \$35 million windfall puts an added handicap upon the development of a third party when it may some day be advantageous for our political system. There is certainly the possibility, as Senator Gore insisted, that such a provision is not giving equal protection of the laws.

If there is merit in the idea that political contributions should be tax deductible, a much better way would be to permit each taxpayer to deduct his contributions up to a certain amount regardless of party or candidate.

Mr. Speaker, in order for us to more thoroughly understand the problem that exists insofar as our present election laws are concerned, I would like to include at this point the history of the development of the Federal election laws

as outlined on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the "Regulation of Political Finance," published in 1966 by the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Citizen's Research Foundation at Princeton, N.J.:

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Federal legislation relating to money in politics first took the form of protection against political assessment of federal employees in 1867. This provision was later extended and broadened in the Civil Service Reform Act of 1883 which forbade the solicitation of campaign funds from any federal officer or employee by a fellow officer or employee, or by an other persons on federal premises. A 1907 law prohibited political contributions by national banks and corporations in election of federal officials. A 1910 Act of Congress, providing for publicity of election campaign receipts and expenditures, was amended in 1911 to require similar pre-election statements and to limit the amounts that could be spent by candidates for the House and Senate. These provisions extended to primary elections and conventions, but provision for this coverage was struck down by the Supreme Court in the Newberry decision in 1921. Subsequent court cases, mainly U.S. vs. Classic, would permit such coverage today, yet Congress has not fully reasserted its power over the nominating phase of the electoral process, and publicity provisions still reflect the Newberry decision.

Relevant federal legislation was codified and revised, but not substantially changed, in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which still remains the basic law although amendments were made to some of its provision in 1944, 1947, and 1948. This act regulates the reporting of receipts and expendi-

tures of political committees that are active in two or more states.

The Hatch Act, enacted in 1939 and amended in 1940, established a \$5,000 limitation, backed by criminal sanctions, on the size of individual contributions made during a calendar year in connection with a campaign for federal office; the act also put a \$3,000,000 limitation on the amount that can be spent by an interstate political committee, to influence or attempt to influence the election of a candidate for federal office.

The prohibition against corporate contributions has been complemented by similar ones against contributions by labor unions in both the Smith-Connally Act of 1944 and the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Thus it is unlawful either for unions or corporations to make direct contributions or expenditures in any federal election, primary election, political convention, or caucus.

State legislation has followed much the same pattern as the federal. The financial activities of candidates for the United States Senate and House are regulated concurrently by the federal and state governments, or by the states alone; campaign finance for all state and local candidates, parties, and committees is regulated by the states alone. Only certain committees operating in two or more states or for the election of federal officers are beyond the control of the states.

With this background, we should review the procedures of the State governments and compare that with present procedures at the Federal level.

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 found on pages 59 through 67 of the "Regulation of Political Finance" provide this information and I would like to include those tables as part of my remarks at this point:

TABLE 1.—Contribution and expenditure statements

[Key: Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s); R—Receipts; D—Disbursements; P—Primary election; G—General election]

State	Statements required from	Statements must contain	Forms provided by State or prescribed by statute	Campaign affected	Time of filing	Failure to file reported to prosecutor	Statement inspected by official	Excessive or illegal expenditures reported to prosecutor
Alaska	Com. ¹	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after P; 30 days after G			
Alabama								
Arizona	Cand., com. & others ²	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days after P; 30 days after G			
Arkansas	Cand.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after P			
California	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	35 days after each			
Colorado	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	(9)			
Connecticut	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes
Delaware								
Florida	Cand., com. & depositories ⁴	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	(9)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia								
Hawaii	Cand., agents & com.	D.		P. & G.	20 days after each			
Idaho	Cand.	R. & D.		P.	20 days after			
Illinois								
Indiana	Cand., agents & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	(7)	Yes		
Iowa	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each ⁵			
Kansas	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	(9)			
Kentucky	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days before each; 30 days after each			
Louisiana								
Maine	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10-15 days before G; 30 days after P. & G.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	20 days after each	Yes		
Massachusetts	Cand., treas. of com. & depositories	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	14 days after P; between 3d. & 2nd Tues. before G; & 14 days after G	Yes	Yes	
Michigan	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days after P; 20 days after G	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	8 days before each; 10 days after each	Yes		
Mississippi	Cand.	R. & D.	Yes	P.	(9)			
Missouri	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montana	Cand., com. & others	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	Cand.: 15 days after each; com. & others—10 days after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nebraska	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹¹			
Nevada								
New Hampshire	Cand., com. & others ¹²	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹³	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Jersey	Cand., com. & depositories	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹⁴			
New Mexico	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹⁵			
New York	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days before each; 20 days after each	Yes ¹⁶	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days before; 20 days after ¹⁷			
North Dakota	Cand.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after each			
Ohio	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	45 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oklahoma	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Cands. 10 days after P only; coms. 10 days after all elections.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oregon	Cand., com. & others ¹⁸	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each	Yes ¹⁹	Yes ¹⁹	Yes ¹⁹
Rhode Island								
South Carolina	Cand.	D.		P. & G.	Before and after each			
South Dakota	Cand., com. & others ²⁰	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each		Yes	Yes

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Contribution and expenditure statements—Continued

[Key: Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s); R—Receipts; D—Disbursements; P—Primary election; G—General election]

State	Statements required from	Statements must contain	Forms provided by State or prescribed by statute	Campaign affected	Time of filing	Failure to file reported to prosecutor	Statement inspected by official	Excessive or illegal expenditures reported to prosecutor
Tennessee	Cand. & campaign mgr.	D.		P. & G.	5-10 days before, cand.; 30 days after, campaign mgr. (or cand. if no mgr.) ²⁸			
Texas	Cand. & others ²¹	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	7-10 days before each; & 10 days after each.	Yes ²²		
Utah	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ²³	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Vermont	Cand.	D.		P.	10 days after			
Virginia	Cand.	D.		P. & G.	30 days after each			
Washington	Cand.	D.		P.	10 days after			
West Virginia	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	7-15 days before each; 30 days after each.	Yes		
Wisconsin	Cand., com. & others ²⁴	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Tuesday before & Tuesday after each.			
Wyoming	Cand., com. & others	R. & D. ²⁵		P. & G.	20 days after each	Yes	Yes	Yes.
United States	Cand., com. & others ²⁶	R. & D.		G.	(27)			

¹ Candidate must file affidavit supporting committee statement.² Statements required from each campaign committee which manages a candidate's campaign before a primary election, or manages the campaign for a political party, and every person who engages in political propaganda, and collects or expends any money or valuable thing in connection therewith.³ Committee statements include receipts and disbursements; candidate statements include only disbursements.⁴ Candidates must file statements within 10 days after primary and 30 days after general election. Committees must file within 30 days after general election only.⁵ Candidate must designate campaign treasurer and bank depository. Statements required from banks acting as campaign fund depositories, as well as from candidates and committees.⁶ Candidates and committees submit statements as follows:^a In the case of candidates for Governor and U.S. Senator: Before the election—on the Monday of each week during the campaign. After the election—15 days after the election.^b All other offices: Before the election—on the first Monday of each month during the campaign. After the election—15 days after the election.^c Depositories to file statements within 15 days after the election.⁷ Candidates must file report of receipts and expenditures within 30 days after primary or general election. The treasurer of a political committee or a political agent must file a report within 20 days.⁸ Candidates must file after both primary and general elections. Political party central committees must file only after general elections.⁹ Candidates must file statements within 30 days after both primary and general elections. Annual statements to be filed on December 31 are required of all political committees and other organizations engaged in promoting the success or defeat of candidates, parties, or constitutional amendments.¹⁰ Contribution statements required 1st and 15th day of each month of the primary campaign and the last Saturday before the primary. Expenditures statements required 30 days after the primary.¹¹ Candidates to file only statements of disbursements within 10 days after each election. Committees, however, must file statements of contributions 15 days before each election, listing the names of persons contributing more than \$25. In addition, each day that an individual contribution exceeding \$25 is made, the committee must file a statement of it. Committee statements of contributions and disbursements must be made within 20 days after each election. A further requirement that individuals contributing more than \$250 to any campaign fund should themselves submit statements was repealed in 1953.¹² Statements required from candidates, fiscal agents designated by the nominators of candidates in presidential preference primary, and state and other political committees.¹³ Statements to be filed as follows:^a The state committee of every political party shall file, not later than the Wednesday preceding the election, with the Secretary of State, an itemized statement, signed and sworn to by its chairman and treasurer. A second statement must be similarly filed not later than the second Friday after the election. Enough additional copies of the statement shall be filed to provide a copy for the state committee of every party on the ballot; the Secretary of State furnishes these to the committees upon request.^b Major candidates and the fiscal agent designated by the nominators of any candidate in the presidential preference primary shall similarly file sworn statements. However, the candidate need not report expenditures by the political committee of his party in elections other than primaries. Other candidates need file only by the second Friday after the election.^c Other political committees shall similarly file sworn statements before and after the election.¹⁴ Candidates and committees must report receipts and disbursements on the Friday or Saturday before an election and disbursements only within 20 days after an election. Bank depositories of campaign funds must report receipts and disbursements 20 days after an election.¹⁵ Candidate must file a statement of expenditures 10 days after the primary and general elections. The committees must file statements of receipts and expenditures within 30 days after each election.¹⁶ Appropriate court may require filing upon complaint of any candidate or 5 qualified voters.¹⁷ Candidates file statements before and after primaries only. Political committees file statements before and after primaries and general elections.¹⁸ Persons expending or contributing more than \$50 must file statement within 10 days after election.¹⁹ Five voters may petition appropriate court for audit of expenditures.²⁰ Any person not a member of such committee who collects or disburses over \$5 must file a statement.²¹ Any person making one or more contributions or loans aggregating more than \$100 to a candidate must report these contributions if the candidate does not report them.²² Voters can institute *quo warrant* proceedings.²³ Candidate's personal committees and state committees must file statements on the second Saturday after such candidate or committee has first made a disbursement or incurred any obligation, and thereafter on the second Saturday of each month until all disbursements have been accounted for. They shall also file a final statement on the Saturday preceding the election to contain all transactions not theretofore accounted for. All other political committees must file statements 30 days after any election.²⁴ Any corporation, association, organization, committee, club or group which advocates, endorses, or opposes any political party, faction or group or any candidate for office, or any constitutional amendment or measures to be voted on by people must file statements.²⁵ Candidates must file statements of expenditures; committees must file statements of both receipts and expenditures. Any other person receiving or expending \$50 on behalf of the campaign must also file statement.²⁶ Statements required from others who spend more than \$50 per annum for purposes of influencing in 2 or more states the election of candidates.²⁷ Candidates must file statements 10 to 15 days before and 30 days after a general election. Committees must file statements on Jan. 1, the 1st and 10th of March, June and September; and between the 10th and 15th day and on the 5th day preceding the date of the general election.²⁸ Requirements for candidates and managers apply to both primary and general elections. In the primary elections statements are filed with the chairman of the executive committee of the party, and in the general elections statements are filed with the Secretary of State.

TABLE 2.—Campaign expenditure limitations and enumeration requirements

[Key: AS—Annual salary; P—Primary election; G—General election; Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s)]

State	Governor	U.S. Senator	U.S. Representative	Campaign affected	Limit applies to expenditures by—	Certain expenditures exempted from limitations	Legitimate expenses enumerated
Alabama	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand. only	Yes	Yes.
Alaska							
Arizona	\$2,500	\$3,500	\$2,500	P	Cand., agent, and coms.	Yes	
Arkansas	\$5,000	100 percent AS ²	100 percent AS ²	(3)	Cand. only		Yes.
California							
Colorado							
Connecticut	(4)	1/4 AS ²	(4)	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶	Yes	Yes.
Delaware							
Florida				P and G separate ⁴			Yes.
Georgia							
Hawaii							Yes.
Idaho	\$2,000	\$5,000	\$2,500	P	Cand. only		Yes.
Illinois							
Indiana	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$10,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand. and agents ⁷	Yes	Yes.
Iowa	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁸	Cand. only		
Kansas	10 percent AS ²	10 percent AS ²	10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁸	Cand. only		
Kentucky	\$10,000			P and G separate ⁸	Cand. ⁶		Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—Campaign expenditure limitations and enumeration requirements—Continued

[Key: AS—Annual salary; P—Primary election; G—General election; Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s)]

State	Governor	U.S. Senator	U.S. Representative	Campaign affected	Limit applies to expenditures by—	Certain expenditures exempted from limitations	Legitimate expenses enumerated
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand., agent, treasurer	Yes	Yes.
Massachusetts	(Limits repealed by amendments in St. 1962, c. 444, sec. 2.)						
Michigan	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹		Yes.
Minnesota	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	P and G combined ¹	Cand. and com.	Yes	Yes.
Mississippi	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$3,500	1st and 2d P separate	Cand. only ¹⁰	Yes	
Missouri	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	P and G separate ¹	Cand. and com.	Yes	
Montana	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$12,500	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
New Jersey	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$15,000	P and G separate ¹	Cand., com., and others	Yes	Yes.
New Mexico	P: \$2,500 G: 10 percent AS ²	P: \$3,500 G: 10 percent AS ²	P: \$2,500 G: 10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹²	Yes	Yes.
New York	\$20,000	\$12,000	\$8,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand., com., and others		Yes.
North Carolina							
North Dakota	15 percent AS ²	15 percent AS ²	15 percent AS ²	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
Ohio	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000 ¹³	P and G separate ¹	Cand. only	Yes	Yes.
Oklahoma	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$25,000	P	Cand. ¹		Yes.
Oregon	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	
Pennsylvania							Yes.
Rhode Island							
South Carolina							
South Dakota	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	P and G combined ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
Tennessee	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$12,500	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹		Yes.
Texas				P and G	Cand. and com.		Yes.
Utah	(Limitations repealed by Laws 1961, ch. 42, sec. 1.)						Yes.
Vermont	\$7,500			P	Cand. ¹		Yes.
Virginia	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)	(¹⁴)	P	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
Washington							
West Virginia	(\$75 for each county in State or district)						Yes.
Wisconsin	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$2,500	P and G combined ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
Wyoming	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	P and G separate ¹	Cand. ¹	Yes	Yes.
United States				G	Cand. and coms. ¹⁵		

¹ P and G combined: Combined aggregate total of expenditures in both primary and general election cannot exceed the limitation.² AS: Limitation based on the annual salary of the office sought.³ The \$5,000 limitation on expenditures by gubernatorial candidates applies to primary campaigns only. The annual salary limitation on congressional candidates includes the aggregate of all expenses in both the primary and general election campaigns.⁴ The amount may not exceed in:

a. Primary campaigns—\$10 for each 1,000 voters, or major portion thereof, who voted at the last preceding election for the candidate of the same political party and same office as the candidate who seeks nomination;

b. General election campaigns—\$15 for each 1,000 electors, or major portion thereof, qualified to vote for office in question at last preceding election.

⁵ P and G separate: Expenditures up to the limit may be made in both the primary and general election campaigns respectively.⁶ Limit applies to expenditures by and on behalf of the candidate with his knowledge and consent.⁷ Limitation applies to the total of all expenditures by the candidate and his agents. Candidates personally may expend additional amounts for letters, postage, printing, advertising, etc.⁸ Limit is \$40 for each 1,000 votes cast for Governor in last preceding presidential year in State or political subdivision in which candidate is running; but no candidate shall be restricted to less than 25 percent of 1 year's compensation or \$100.⁹ Limit is \$7,000 plus 5 cents for each of the total number of persons voting in State at last general election.¹⁰ Contributions by corporations to candidates for certain high judicial offices prohibited.¹¹ Limit is \$8 for each 100 votes cast for all candidates for president in the State, county, district, or municipality, at the last preceding presidential election.¹² State law prohibits expenditures of any money by a political party on behalf of a primary candidate.¹³ A candidate for office of Representative in Congress is limited to 3 cents for each voter in his district voting for a candidate for presidential elector at the last prior presidential election or \$4,000, whichever is greater.¹⁴ Limit is 50 cents for every vote cast for the candidate of his party receiving the largest vote at the last preceding gubernatorial election.¹⁵ Unless the laws of the State prescribe a lesser amount, a candidate may expend up to:a. \$10,000 if a candidate for Senator, or \$2,500 if a candidate for Representative;
b. An amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding \$25,000 if a candidate for Senator or \$5,000 if a candidate for Representative.¹⁶ Political committees each limited to \$3,000,000 per annum.

TABLE 3.—Regulation of campaign contributions

State	Corporate contributions prohibited	Labor union contributions prohibited	Individual contributions limited to—	Solicitation from State employees prohibited ¹	Solicitation from candidates illegal	Contributions under fictitious names illegal
Alabama	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Alaska						
Arizona	Yes					
Arkansas				(²)		
California				Yes		
Colorado						
Connecticut	Yes				Yes	Yes.
Delaware						
Florida	Yes ³		\$1,000 ⁴		Yes	
Georgia	Yes					
Hawaii	Yes					
Idaho						
Illinois				(⁴)		
Indiana	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes.
Iowa	Yes			Yes		
Kansas	Yes ⁵					
Kentucky	Yes			Yes		
Louisiana	Yes			Yes		
Maine						Yes.
Maryland			\$2,500			Yes.
Massachusetts	Yes		(⁶)	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Michigan	Yes				Yes	Yes.
Minnesota	Yes				Yes	
Mississippi					Yes	
Missouri	Yes				Yes	
Montana	Yes		Yes ⁷	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Nebraska	Yes		\$1,000 ⁸			
Nevada						
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	\$5,000	(⁹)	Yes	
New Jersey	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes.
New Mexico						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—Regulation of campaign contributions—Continued

State	Corporate contributions prohibited	Labor union contributions prohibited	Individual contributions limited to—	Solicitation from State employees prohibited ¹	Solicitation from candidates illegal	Contributions under fictitious names illegal
New York	Yes			Yes	Yes	
North Carolina	Yes					
North Dakota	Yes					Yes
Ohio	Yes			Yes ¹⁰	Yes	
Oklahoma	Yes					
Oregon	Yes ¹¹			Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes		(12)		Yes
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota	Yes					
Tennessee	Yes					
Texas	Yes	Yes		Yes		
Utah	Yes				Yes	
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia	Yes		\$5,000	Yes	Yes	
Wisconsin	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Wyoming	Yes			Yes		
United States	Yes	Yes	\$5,000 ¹³	Yes ¹⁴		

¹ Generally refers to employees under a civil service or merit system.² It is unlawful for any person whomsoever to assess any State employee for any political purpose whatever, or to coerce by threats or otherwise any such employee into making a subscription or contribution for any such purpose.³ The following persons also are prohibited from making campaign contributions directly or indirectly: (a) Holders of horse or dog racing permits; (b) holders of licenses for the sale of intoxicating beverages; and (c) operators of public utilities, except non-profit cooperatives.⁴ State employees whose tenure is subject to merit principles are forbidden to engage in certain specified prohibited political activities during working hours, and the prohibited activities include soliciting money for political purposes and making contributions of money in behalf of candidates or in support of public or political issues. The prohibition does not apply to soliciting and making contributions after working hours.⁵ Contributions by such corporations as banks, trusts, railroads, and utilities are forbidden.⁶ Individual contributions during year are limited to \$3,000 to 1 candidate, \$3,000 to 1 party, and \$3,000 to non-elected political committees not organized on behalf of any candidate.⁷ Any person expending more than \$50 in a campaign must file an itemized statement and give a duplicate to the candidate or treasurer of the political organization whose success or defeat he has sought to promote.⁸ No treasurer of a political committee shall receive or accept more than \$1,000 from any 1 person to be spent in any one campaign.⁹ Employees under civil service are not allowed to contribute money for the promotion of candidates or political issues.¹⁰ Solicitation from civil servants prohibited and receipt of contributions from mine inspectors prohibited.¹¹ Contributions prohibited from banks, utility corporations, or a majority of their stockholders.¹² Contributions may not be solicited from civil service employees and those employed by the commission and the board of parole.¹³ \$5,000 limitation applies only to contributions to a national committee during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for an elective Federal office. Hatch Act specifically excludes contributions to State or local committees from this limitation.¹⁴ Applies to Federal employees or to persons receiving salary or compensation for services from money derived from the U.S. Treasury.

TABLE 4.—Penalties and provisions for enforcement

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
Alabama	Misdemeanor; fine from \$100 to \$500.	Misdemeanor; fined up to \$500 and may be jailed or sentenced to hard labor up to 6 months. Candidate disqualified from office.	
Alaska			
Arizona	After primary—no certificate of nomination; unsuccessful candidate or other persons guilty of misdemeanor fined \$25 to \$500. After general election—guilty of misdemeanor.	Fine of \$100 to \$2,000 and jail 6 months to 2 years. Barred from holding office in the State.	
Arkansas	For most candidates, fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year; ineligible to hold office, U.S. Congressmen and U.S. Senators—fine \$50 to \$1,000.	Forfeit nomination for any office. Misdemeanor; fine \$500 to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	
California	Misdemeanor; no certificate of nomination or election to be issued.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	
Colorado	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 1 year.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file. (For illegal expenditures such as bribery.)	Any person may file affidavit with district attorney or State attorney general stating name of person who has violated any provisions of act and stating facts which constitute alleged offense. District attorney or State attorney general shall then prosecute. Prosecuting officer shall be notified and shall proceed to prosecute.
Connecticut	Fine \$25 per day while in default.	Fined up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	
Delaware			
Florida	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 or jail up to 6 months. Knowing violation voids nomination or election.	Same as for failure to file.	Electors may file petition with circuit court, attorney general must act as counsel for State.
Georgia			
Hawaii	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$500 and/or jail 6 months.	Fine \$100 to \$1,000 and/or 2 years jail or hard labor. Must vacate office. Disqualified from voting and from being elected to, holding or occupying any office, elective or appointive.	
Idaho	Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 and/or 1 to 6 months jail. Ineligible to run for office; no name on ballot.	Disqualified from nomination or office; misdemeanor; jail up to 6 months and/or fine \$300.	
Illinois			
Indiana	Can't get commission or certificate of election, or take office until statement filed. Misdemeanor; fine \$1 to \$500. Jail 30 days to 1 year, or both, and disenfranchised up to 5 years.	Ineligible for public office for 4 years. Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	Prosecutor notified for appropriate action. Defeated candidate or any 10 electors may petition to prevent a candidate alleged to have violated Corrupt Practices Act from taking office.
Iowa	Misdemeanor; jail up to 1 year and/or fine up to \$500.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	Officials in place where crime was committed shall prosecute.
Kansas	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000.	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000. Candidate must vacate office; disqualified from holding public office for 2 years.	
Kentucky	No name on ballot; no certification of nomination or election. Candidates fined not more than \$500. If committees or managers fail to file, fine \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 1 month to 1 year.	Fine \$100 to \$1,000. Nomination or election voided.	Candidate receiving certain percentage of votes may contest election. Grand jury may investigate alleged violations.
Louisiana			
Maine	Daily assessment of fine. If assessment not paid, person becomes disqualified and his name may not appear on official ballot used for any election during same calendar year.		Campaign statements reviewed by campaign reports committee composed of 2 members from the senate and 3 from the house of representatives of State legislature. Attorney general acts as committee counsel and must prosecute offenders.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—Penalties and provisions for enforcement—Continued

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
Maryland.....	Can't be considered elected, assume duties, or receive salary until report is filed; fine of \$1,000 and/or 1 year imprisonment.	Fine of \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for 1 year, and for some illegal expenditures shall be ineligible for any public office or for any public employment for period of 4 years from and after time of commission of such offense.	Within 30 days after election, citizens may petition court that successful candidate was guilty of corrupt practices. Court will submit findings (if high State office) to secretary of state who will then refer them to appropriate person or legislative body or to Governor to declare election void. Duty of State's attorneys to prosecute whenever they feel they have good reason to believe corrupt practices involved. ¹
Massachusetts.....	Imprisonment for not more than 6 months or fine of not more than \$500.		Officer in charge of receiving statements notifies attorney general who, if satisfied there is cause, shall institute civil proceedings or refer case to district attorney for action in criminal courts. Courts may compel filing of statement on application of attorney general or district attorney or petition of any candidate voted for, or any 5 persons qualified to vote at election on account of which expenditures were made.
Michigan.....	Person can't take office, collect salaries, or receive certificate of nomination or election until he has filed account. Fine up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Fine of up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Alleged violations reported to prosecuting attorney or attorney general who shall institute civil or criminal proceedings.
Minnesota.....	No name on ballot. Candidate disqualified from holding public office. Gross misdemeanor.	Same as for failure to file.	County attorney shall inquire into and prosecute cases which come to his notice.
Mississippi.....	Willful and deliberate violations shall be punishable by fine not more than \$500 and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year. Forfeit nomination or general election.	do.	Petition for judicial review of election may be made.
Missouri.....	Fined not more than \$1,000. Can't take office until statement is filed. ²	Forfeiture of election.	Person receiving next highest vote may petition attorney general for action against successful candidate upon posting \$1,000 bond. If attorney general does not prosecute in 10 days, applicant may prosecute at his own expense (for excessive or illegal expenditures).
Montana.....	\$25 per day while in default. Name won't be printed on ballot and no certificate of election.	Deprivation of nomination or office. Fine up to \$5,000 and/or up to 1 year in jail.	Elector may file petition contesting election with court, must post bond up to \$2,000, on basis of illegal or excessive expenditures. Official receiving statements shall notify prosecutor.
Nebraska.....	Candidate: Fine up to \$1,000. No certificate of nomination or election; can't take office. Treasurer: Fine \$50 to \$500; further failure after notice to comply—jail 2 to 6 months. ⁴	Fine up to \$50 and/or jail 6 months.	Voters may file complaint with State attorney general to have him prosecute. In cases involving members of the State legislature, a voter may file complaint with the legislature, which shall hear and determine cases of contested election of its members and for all officers of the executive department of the State.
Nevada.....			
New Hampshire.....	Willful violations of rules relating to primary may disqualify candidate from ensuing election. Not entitled to nomination or election until filing. Fine \$100 to \$1,000 and/or 30 days to 6 months in jail.	Same as penalty for failure to file except no refusal of certification.	Any person voted for at an election for any office, or any voter, may make a complaint in writing to attorney general of any violation. Any person may bring proceeding in equity against primary candidate who violates law to disqualify him from ensuing election.
New Jersey.....	Office forfeited by nonfiling of statement or filing of false statement. Court may also disenfranchise voter and disqualify him from holding office in State for period of time. Candidate at primary election with next highest number of votes shall be put on ballot.	Office forfeited. Same as for failure to file. Persons making unauthorized expenditures are guilty of a misdemeanor.	Voters may contest election on ground of illegal or excessive expenditures. If candidate has taken office, attorney general shall institute appropriate proceedings for vacation of such office, or shall notify appropriate legislative body to which candidate was elected.
New Mexico.....	Primary election: No certificate of nomination; no name on ballot; fine of \$25 to \$500. General election: Can't take office; no certificate of election; fine up to \$500. ⁴	Primary election: Fine of \$100 to \$2,000 and imprisonment for 6 months to 2 years. General election: Same as for failure to file.	
New York.....	Guilty of misdemeanor; imprisonment up to 1 year and/or fine of \$100 to \$500.	Same as for failure to file.	Court, in proceeding instituted by candidate or 5 qualified voters, may compel persons or committees to file statement, to make statement conform to law, or to comply with any other provisions of section. Court may require bond and sureties from petitioner.
North Carolina.....	Misdemeanor; fine and/or imprisonment. Court may remove from office and declare ineligible to hold office for 2 years.	Same as for failure to file.	Duty of secretary of state and superior court clerks to call for required statements and report violations to attorney general, who should initiate prosecution.
North Dakota.....	Fine of \$25 per day while in default; name can't go on ballot until report is filed.	Deprivation of nomination for office.	Offender deprived of office by contest proceedings.
Ohio.....	No certificate of nomination or election until report is filed. Failure to file within time limit shall disqualify said person from becoming candidate in any future election for period of 5 years; candidates for an elected office having a 6-year term shall be disqualified from becoming a candidate in any future election for a period of 7 years. Failure to file at any time: Fine \$25 to \$500 and/or jail 10 days to 6 months.	Forfeiture of nomination or election; same as for failure to file. Fine \$100 to \$500 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Secretary of state notifies attorney general of violation and he must prosecute. Citizens may present petition to court of common pleas or any judge thereof, with security, but election law does not specifically provide for any special procedure for citizens' prosecutions in this area.
Oklahoma.....	Candidate: Misdemeanor; fine of \$25 to \$500 and imprisonment 5 to 30 days. No certification of nomination. ⁴	Guilty of misdemeanor; fined \$100 to \$2,000 and jail for 6 months to 2 years; candidate to be barred from holding office in State.	Prosecution by county attorneys.
Oregon.....	Candidate: Fine \$25 per day while in default; no name on ballot and no certification of election.	Deprivation of nomination or office. Can't hold any office during term for which he was nominated or elected. Jail up to 1 year and/or fine up to \$5,000.	District attorney required to prosecute alleged violations which come to his attention from election officials or from complaints and notices by citizens under penalty of forfeiture of office.
Pennsylvania.....	Can't take oath of office, take office, or receive salary until all statements filed. Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or 1 month to 2 years in jail.	Ousted from office or from nomination. Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail 1 month to 2 years. Willful violation by candidate disqualifies him forever from holding public office in State; willful violation by any person requires disenfranchisement for 4 years.	Any 5 electors may petition court for an audit; district attorney must institute criminal proceedings. If it appears that candidate has violated these sections, attorney general shall institute quo warranto proceedings against such candidate for ouster from nomination or from office.
Rhode Island.....			

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—Penalties and provisions for enforcement—Continued

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
South Carolina	Election null and void. Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor 1 to 6 months, or both at the discretion of the court.	Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor 1 to 6 months, or both at the discretion of the court.	
South Dakota	Forfeiture of office; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Same as for failure to file.	Attorney general investigates and prosecutes.
Tennessee	No certificate of nomination or election. Fine \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 30 days to 12 months.		
Texas	Fine \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 1 to 5 years. Forfeit right to place name on ballot at any subsequent primary, special, or general election. If he fails to report any receipt or expenditure, liable for double the amount or value to each opposing candidate and also for reasonable attorneys' fees.	Candidate and campaign managers civilly liable to each opposing candidate for double the amount or value of such unlawful campaign expenditures and reasonable attorney fees for collecting the same. Also, fine of \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 1 to 5 years.	Quo warranto proceedings may be instituted in district courts.
Utah	Name won't be printed on ballot for ensuing election; disqualified from holding office until statement is filed. ¹	Election voided; person ousted and excluded from office; misdemeanor. ¹	Filing officer inspects statements and reports violations to county attorney who must institute proceedings if evidence is sufficient; candidates or voters may complain to filing officer of violations or may petition district judge, Attorney general, or Governor to investigate alleged violation.
Vermont	Fine up to \$500 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Fine up to \$500 or jail up to 90 days.	
Virginia	No certification of election; can't take office; misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Election declared null and void.	
Washington	Misdemeanor; fine not less than \$50, and/or jail not more than 1 year. No name on ballot; no certification of election.	Disqualified from holding any public office or employment during period of 5 years subsequent to date of conviction. Vacate office.	Prosecutor notified for appropriate action.
West Virginia	No name on ballot; no certification. Failure to file on part of treasurer or political committee is punishable by 2 to 6 months in jail.	Voiding of election and ousting and excluding candidate from office. ¹	Any elector may petition for permission to bring charges against candidate or committee for alleged violation.
Wisconsin	No name on ballot; no certification of election. Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Misdemeanor. Fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Upon notice by filing officer or petition by voter, county or prosecuting attorney must prosecute alleged violation.
Wyoming			

¹ Findings are certified to presiding officer of appropriate legislative body in case of a violation by any of its members.

² Filing officer must notify delinquent of his failure to file and, if the latter has not expended more than allowed, and files within 10 days of receipt of this notice, he will not be assessed the penalties provided.

³ Failure to file on part of treasurer of political committee subject to fine of \$50 to \$500; if treasurer receives notice from 5 resident freeholders and still fails to file, jail for 2 to 6 months.

⁴ Failure to file on part of committee treasurer subject to fine of \$50 to \$500; failure to file after notice, jail for 2 to 6 months.

⁵ For treasurers of political committees, fine is \$50 to \$500 and/or 6 months in jail.

⁶ Penalty for violation by committee is a fine of \$25 to \$500 and imprisonment for 3 to 12 months.

⁷ Penalty for committee treasurers is 2 to 6 months in jail.

Mr. Speaker, with this background, we can compare the election laws of the various States with the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 which governs the spending of campaign funds by Federal candidates. On June 10, 1966, Life magazine discussed the act in an editorial. That editorial said in part:

The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—the law that still regulates campaign spending—was aptly named. If ever a law was designed to promote corrupt practices, this is it. For instance, it provides that a congressman can spend only \$5,000 in a bid for election and a senator \$25,000. But it sets no limit on the number of outside committees that can help by spending an equal amount. Thus, a senatorial candidate has to maintain the fiction that the dozen or more committees set up to accept donations for his cause do so without his "knowledge or consent."

The extent of this and other shenanigans can be gauged by the fact that all parties reported total expenses across the country in the '64 election as \$47.8 million. A reliable estimate of the amount actually spent, starting with the primaries, puts it at \$200 million.

Much of the other \$150 million did not have to be reported to the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate. And even the transactions that should have been reported—but weren't—will never be investigated. Justice Department policy is "not to institute investigations . . . in the absence of a request from the Clerk of the House of Representatives or Secretary of the Senate." Since both of those men are elected by the houses they serve, it is not surprising that neither has ever asked for an investigation of any member's election.

The problem this Congress faces is threefold. It is first of all important that Members of Congress include as part of the public record their assets, lia-

bilities, and sources of income. We must also move to establish standards of conduct for Members of the House.

Secondly, we must insure in this country the highest possible degree of honesty in elections by instituting full disclosure of campaign funds. We must also make available a means for many more people to financially aid in the election of his favorite candidate or party.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we must establish a method of enforcing these procedures. We must take out of the hands of the employees of the House and Senate and place in a National Commission and a Joint Ethics Committee the power to punish violators of the election code and judge the conduct of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bill of the resolution I have introduced today would accomplish these important tasks. These are important steps in the long road toward strengthening the legislative branch of Government and insuring the continued viability of our republican form of government. As the Madison, Wis., Capital Times said on Monday, February 20, 1967:

The issue of ethics in government continues to haunt politicians and public. There is a disposition on the part of both to ignore it. But it keeps popping up. The politicians try to give the impression that the issue doesn't exist but they also devoutly wish it would go away. The public doesn't like to be reminded of unpleasant things—such as the waywardness of the men they elect to public office. But if these things are not called to public attention and discussed, it would be a question of time before free government would collapse from the unbearable burden of corruption it would have to support.

I trust the Congress will consider this matter in the very near future and will act favorably on these proposals.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and I would like to emphasize the importance of his comments on these provisions so far as the election law goes. Certainly, it is only fair that a candidate be required to report and be subject to the same requirements imposed upon him as any Member of this body.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas and the entire freshman group of Republican Members of the 90th Congress for his and their leadership in suggesting this code of ethics.

As one who entered the House during the 89th Congress, but just now, with you, approaches a first full term, I am in full agreement that the ethical standards of the House and the Congress should be high and equally applicable to all Members. Appropriate action must and will be taken to assure this, and your proposal is a very good first step.

I came here from the New York City Council last year. We there had a very stringent code of ethics for a legislative body, and it was a salutary thing. The Congress can well take heed in this area of New York City's example.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER].

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am

proud to join a large number of freshmen Congressmen in offering resolutions to establish an Ethics Committee for the House and also to change the rules of this House to provide for the disclosure of assets and the disclosure of nepotism.

Last week, we received the report of the President's Crime Commission. The cost and extent of criminal behavior prevalent in our country must be a matter of great concern to all of us. Not many Americans escape the sweep of its indictment, either as participants or indifferent bystanders.

This past weekend we learned of cheating scandals in one of our service academies.

On Wednesday of this week we will consider a report concerning the conduct of a Congressman-elect.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Americans are sick of feeling soiled by the times in which they live. If this is indeed a sickness, the people expect the Congress to be a physician, not one of the patients.

We have all heard the old bromide that you cannot legislate morality. That does not mean we may not exemplify morality. That does not mean that we cannot make the practice of immorality more difficult.

If this House cannot bestir itself to clean its own affairs, how, Mr. Speaker, can we expect to clean our streams, clean our air, and reduce crime on a national scale? If we cannot take this small step now, we jeopardize for a long time to come our reputation and the confidence Americans want so desperately to feel in their Congress. This resolution cannot be opposed on the basis of too great an expense, nor should it be opposed on grounds of partisanship. The Good Book says there is a time and a season for the events of life and history. This is the season and now is the time to set our house in order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I am pleased to join him in his essential objective.

Mr. Speaker, as a general rule for better Government operation I prefer better and more effective use of existing committees rather than the addition of new ones. Those who are critical of the proliferation of committees perform an important public service.

The Adam Clayton Powell case now confronts us with the question of whether existing facilities, specifically the House Administration Committee, is the appropriate vehicle to respond to the present overriding demand of the American people, and our own deep desires, that rules of standards and conduct of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives be more clearly defined, be raised to a higher plateau, and be more effectively enforced. I should like to commend the members of the House Administration Committee on their efficient examination of facts in the Powell case and for the high quality of their service. It is now my belief that this House must

establish stronger and more tangible rules than have been previously considered necessary, and stronger enforcement and investigatory procedure than has previously sufficed. The matter of standards and conduct of Members has become, in my opinion, a subject for an exclusive responsibility of the select committee which this resolution creates.

The creation of the select committee is another acknowledgment that conduct and standards of members of the U.S. House of Representatives are expected to be far superior to those expected of others.

The addition of a rule requiring comprehensive disclosure of assets, liabilities, special interests, substantial income, gifts, and reimbursements to Members and those employees and officers of the House who are compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 annually is likewise subject to the general suspicion that such disclosure requirements may serve to mislead, to hide and protect the cleverly unethical, rather than to actually disclose the personal gains and benefits derived from political influence. But here again, it is my belief in view of the heavy responsibilities which we bear as Members of this House, that we cannot surrender to a fatalistic attitude that no improvement is possible, and that it is now our opportunity and bounden responsibility to forge a meaningful upgrading in the rules which govern standards and conduct of Members of the House of Representatives.

I join in the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the gentleman from Utah for that statement.

Before yielding further, I would like to note for the Record our pleasure at having the gentleman from Florida in the Speaker's chair. He has, perhaps, done more in this body than any other Member to fight for a strong code of ethics. I believe it is altogether appropriate that we be speaking here while he is presiding. I believe further it is altogether appropriate that he is here when we new Republican Members are speaking out for many of the things for which he has been fighting for many years.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE].

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I wish, first, to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for his effort in bringing this matter to the floor and for the efforts he has extended so far in coordinating the efforts of those of us who are appearing in support of this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we in the House of Representatives must put aside consideration of such pressing problems as the Vietnamese conflict to discuss the personal conduct of Members of Congress. But the fact remains that before we can expect the people to respect the laws we make, there must be respect for the lawmakers themselves.

There are those who will question the propriety of freshman Congressmen taking the floor to propose ethical standards for all Members, most of whom are many years our senior. As for myself, I can only reply that it was not necessary for me to be elected to Congress to be en-

dowed with the capacity to tell right from wrong.

Furthermore, I feel certain that the big turnover in the congressional elections last fall was in no small measure due to a lack of public confidence in governmental officials on all levels. The reasons were not hard to find: a Senate employee who had used his position for personal gain, talk of a credibility gap, the personal conduct of certain Members of Congress themselves. If those of us who were suddenly thrust into positions of leadership do not seek to restore confidence in public officials, then the American people have merely traded tweedledee for tweedledum. I, of course, do not refer to those Members who have been returned.

It is most gratifying to me to find so many of the new Congressmen responding to this challenge with proposals for putting our house in order. The diverse approaches in our bills illustrate the many paths available to us. None of those participating in the discussion today are being so presumptuous as to say we have all the answers. On the contrary, each of us has been encouraged to suggest varying methods for establishing ethical standards in order that the Congress may choose the best from each.

It is in this spirit that I have today introduced a resolution on ethics and disclosure. My bill differs from the basic measure being offered by the gentlemen from Texas and others in several significant respects.

For one thing, I suggest a revolving membership for the proposed Committee on Standards and Conduct. No Member should be permitted to sit in judgment of other Members for a prolonged period of time.

My resolution authorizes the proposed committee to issue advisory opinions, upon request, when a Member is uncertain as to whether or not some course of action open to him is ethical.

I have also proposed penalties, and I suggest that where there is a finding of willful violation of the House rules, the recommendation must be expulsion. And if the House agrees to the recommendation, the Member expelled may never again serve in a Government position, elective or otherwise, except for the military.

I have not attempted to define a code of ethics, but the committee is required under my bill to issue its first recommendations by August 31 of this year. I would expect that report to contain a code of ethics at that time.

The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is expected, of course, to devise a code of ethics. In this connection, I would expect the committee to consider such matters as disclosure of confidential information acquired during official duties for personal gain; the acceptance of gifts; pressuring employees to make contributions to political and charitable organizations; use of the franking privilege and abuse of the accounts available to us for running a congressional office; or, for that matter, slush funds and the use of campaign contributions for personal purposes. Likewise, the committee should formulate rules by which communications between

a Member and an agency with respect to any adjudicatory matter or rulemaking would be made a part of the public record of that proceeding. I would suggest to the committee that where it is difficult to translate ethical standards into legislative form, the oath be rewritten to include those provisions.

I hope it never becomes necessary for the proposed committee to investigate a Member. But if it does, there will be no doubt that the House of Representatives is prepared to discipline its own. Creating the committee will, at the very least, remove from partisan politics such unpleasant matters as the one we must face on Wednesday.

Most of the bills being introduced today require each Member to file annually a public statement of his personal holdings. My bill will extend most of these requirements to candidates for the House of Representatives. This requirement should cause no embarrassment to anyone who is truly above suspicion, for we are indeed public servants.

If, when history judges the record of the 90th Congress, it can be said that this was the time when the faith in the Congress was restored to the American people, then it can also be written that this was the time when the principle of representative government was reaffirmed and freedom did indeed flourish.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. I should like to take this opportunity to applaud the fine statement just made by the gentleman from Idaho and to draw particular attention to one point he made; that is, our discussion today and the bills and resolutions we offer are presented with the complete and wholehearted support of the party leaders. I believe it is important to point out for the country that we discussed our intention with our party leaders and received full encouragement from them to proceed in this manner. This is important to recognize. I would underscore that statement.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the gentleman from Michigan, and I agree totally. I am glad the gentleman brought out that additional information.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for his comment. This is one thing I wish to underscore; the fact that we are not talking behind the backs of our elders. We have their support. This is important.

I commend the gentleman for making this addition to my comments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every body of men engaged in a common task, seeking a common objective, and working together to achieve a common end should, as a matter of course, have the benefit of a common set of rules to guide them in their personal conduct as a member of that body.

I speak of the advisability of having a code of ethics governing the conduct

and standards of Members of Congress. After all, we are here only for one purpose, and that purpose is to serve our constituency and our country in an able and honorable way. But, considering the relative values we all possess, it does seem presumptuous to expect every Member of this large body to hold identical sets of values where their conduct in relation to this body is concerned.

It seems to me, therefore, that if we had an established set of rules, which were unquestionably enforced, they would help each of us to serve our constituency and country in the able and honorable way expected of us. This would materially benefit this Congress by allowing it to proceed with its important work, secure in the knowledge that each Member is aware of his obligations, and will abide by them once he is so apprised.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt consideration of this resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and establishing clear-cut requirements for Members of this House of Representatives.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman for his timely comments.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a deep concern over recent acts that have cast dark shadows of doubt over the entire Congress in the minds of the people of the United States.

Today, I have introduced a separate resolution that, like others introduced here today, would create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

However, on the matter of disclosure of financial interests, my resolution differs from others. The difference is in the method of disclosure and in the teeth put into the requirement for accurate disclosure.

This resolution would require Members and certain employees to file annually with the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of their financial statement and a copy of their income tax return. The latter, of course, would require further implementing legislation. Under my resolution, the Comptroller General of the United States and the select committee would be authorized to examine these financial reports and, should they find anything wrong, would be empowered to conduct such investigations as they deemed necessary. Reports of wrongdoings would be filed by the Comptroller General with the Justice Department and with the House for appropriate action.

As a new Member of this body, and as the single Representative from the State of Delaware to this body, I urge the passage of this bill to establish in the House an effective body to investigate and act on allegations of misconduct of Members and of staff members so that the American people will not continue to have reservations regarding the integrity of this body and reservations regarding its willingness to condone the actions of Members and staff members guilty of misconduct.

Justice for Members and staff members who might be accused, as well as, public demand for the highest standards of conduct by Members and their staffs, makes imperative the immediate establishment of this Select Committee on Standards and Conduct—and certain amendments to House rules that will provide the means to quickly ferret out any who might be guilty of misconduct.

Under the resolution that I have introduced, a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct would be established, having a membership composed of 12 members divided evenly between the majority and minority parties. It would be empowered to recommend rules and regulations it deems necessary to insure proper standards of conduct by Members and by staff members of the House. It would have authority to investigate alleged breaches of conduct, recommend appropriate action and report violations of law to the proper Federal and State authorities.

Further, the resolution I offer would amend the rules of the House to require that Members and their employees who are paid more than \$10,000 annually file with the Comptroller General of the United States a financial statement and a copy of their income tax return. This closely parallels a proposal made in the other body by the senior member of the congressional delegation from Delaware.

This section of my resolution differs from others in that the others require only the filing of a financial statement.

The difference is in the amount of teeth we want to put in legislation requiring disclosure of financial interests. A financial statement can reflect as much or as little as the preparer wishes it to reflect. Most of us would report assets and liabilities to the letter and intent of the law. However, it is not the actions of most of us that have caused us concern, and that recently have caused a decline in the respect of the House by the American people.

On the other hand, an individual could if he so desired, simply file an incomplete financial statement—there seems to be no punishment for that—or could conceal his assets in the names of other parties.

By the requirement to have Members and certain staff members file a copy of their annual income tax return along with their financial statement, we would give teeth to the requirement for accurate disclosure of financial interests. While there may be no penalties for filing an incomplete financial statement, there are severe penalties for filing a false income tax return. And the proper filing of the latter with the Comptroller General of the United States would prompt complete and accurate disclosure of the former.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. COWGER].

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas, and the other new Members of Congress for their sincere interest in establishing rules of conduct for the Congress. It is quite obvious that public opinion dictates a firm and clear state-

ment of principles from all of us—new and old, important and the new and the mighty, rich and poor, Republican and Democrat.

I am in complete favor with this bill and urge its adoption. We must have a strong measure—if not this one—then, at least another that will be equally as demanding. For my part, I intend to immediately comply with the spirit of this bill, by furnishing to the Clerk of the Congress, a complete statement of my assets, my interests, and my income. It is hoped that all our other colleagues will join us in this endeavor.

Thank you.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished president of the new Republican Members of this Congress, and thank him for those comments.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today, I join with many of my colleagues in calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and for the establishment of requirements calling for disclosure of assets and liabilities, and certain business, lobby, and nepotism relationships.

As we all know, Congress adopted a "code of ethics" in July 1958, that was intended to apply to all individuals in Government service. Regrettably, the wording of the code is, of necessity, general, and therefore lacking in strength. It has no muscle.

Our effort today is an attempt to add strength to the "code of ethics" that now exists. In my mind, it is good that this is being attempted in a positive light and not in a negative—do not do—manner.

President Calvin Coolidge said:

Little progress can be made by merely attempting to repress what is evil; our hope lies in developing what is good.

Today, the 90th Congress is being challenged to develop what is good.

The resolution that I introduce today calls for the public recording of those relationships and situations which, in some cases, are considered questionable. The resolution does not say that the hiring of relatives is all bad. It does not say the business connections are all bad. It does not say that communications with lobbyists are bad. What it does say is that these relationships should be recorded in such a way that the public can observe them and determine when "conflicts of interest" exist.

John C. Calhoun observed that—

The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices a public trust.

Hopefully, the resolution here offered will make it possible for the public to evaluate the manner in which these officeholders honor this trust.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for this time.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for those comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] and many of my other colleagues in introducing this ethics and disclosure resolution. Since

my election last November, I have heard from many of my constituents who seem to be losing their confidence in many of our public officials.

I would like to quote from one letter which expresses a rather harsh and unjustified opinion of Congress:

I, like millions of other Americans, have come to realize that Congress has degenerated to a mere shadow of its once great image. The conduct of many representatives and senators has been highly reprehensible. Now, one member is trying to blackmail Congress because he knows that a large number of members are guilty of criminal misconduct and political immorality.

Although I have been in Congress only a short time, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the conduct of one or two Members may have tarnished the good reputation of this great body. There is no doubt in my mind that the great majority of the Members of Congress are of the highest caliber and their integrity is above reproach. I believe this impression must be corrected and that public confidence in Congress must be restored.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urgently hope this or similar legislation will be adopted. It will go a long way toward maintaining the faith of the American people in their Government.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE], my fellow colleague, and I believe I speak for all when I say that many Members of this Congress have received this type of letter, and many of us know that the people are waiting for the Congress to act in this important field.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for his remarks and the initiative he has taken in bringing this issue before the House.

As a newly elected Congressman, I feel certain that there are very few Members on either side of the aisle who do not practice adherence to a high code of personal morality and conduct.

Because of this, there is an almost unanimous concern for the good name of this body on the part of the membership.

In an effort to give these feelings positive form, I have earlier in this session introduced a bill which would bring about changes in the House rules making it impossible for any individual Member of this great body, regardless of race or political status, to corrupt his high office or bring shame on the Congress of the United States.

I feel strongly that no duly elected individual Member of Congress should be singled out from our midst to be judged against any special standard against which we are not all ready and willing to be judged.

In order to demonstrate to the people of the entire world in a clear and convincing manner that we are men and women who are as true to duty as the needle to the pole, who do not fear to call sin by its true name, men and women who will stand for right though the heavens fall, I urge the entire Congress,

and particularly the Members who sit in positions of leadership on both sides of the aisle, to insist upon the immediate study of, and action upon, proposed changes in House rules that will renew public confidence in the integrity and honesty of this bastion of representative government.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and the other participating Members of the 90th Club. I am most anxious that we take this decisive step to put our house in order—by boldly introducing legislation to formulate a strong code of ethics.

The present conduct of Members of Congress is of vital concern to every American—it should be of utmost, of paramount, concern to the Members of Congress to meet this issue head on and to do something constructive and meaningful to resolve the problem which confronts us. We are and must ever be servants of the people who choose us to represent them in the U.S. Congress—and we not only must serve with dignity and integrity, but there should be no doubt or cloud in the understanding of the American people. Confidence in all Members of Congress in all their endeavors should never again be shaken.

It is surprising that such a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has not been established long before now. Let us not let another session of Congress become history without enactment of appropriate legislation to establish clearly recognized standards of conduct and ethics.

Today I join in introduction and support of an appropriate resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. There are a number of good approaches to the problem. Let us put our heads together and come out with a good workable solution we can all live with—one that will remove the public cynicism which unfortunately exists today.

I fear no standards which can gauge and measure my personal conduct as a Member of the U.S. Congress. Let us get on with the job which confronts us.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my distinguished colleague from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today as one of the cosponsors of this resolution because I deeply believe that it is essential for Congress to act promptly and decisively to preserve what is left of our integrity and respect in the eyes of the American people. Today there is doubt in too many minds across

the country about the personal conduct of Members of this body.

In 2 days, we will act on the case of a man who, as a Congressman, used his position in Government for his own personal gain. The other body of Congress is today conducting a similar investigation into the conduct of one of its Members.

Unfortunately it takes only one corrupt Congressman to seed the false idea that all Members of Congress are guilty of similar indiscretions. Today, much of the growing public cynicism is due to our own ponderous inability to come to grips with the problem of implementing some tough, but fair, standards of personal conduct. It is not enough to just take strong action against the occasional publicly identified offender, but we—to a man—must establish and live by the very highest objective public standards of personal conduct. Let us get moving and demonstrate to the American people beyond any doubt that we are deeply honored to serve in our capacity of public trust and wish to act, in every instance, only in the public interest.

Let us establish an objective code of conduct which will apply to all Members of this body by which the activities of each and every Member can be measured. Only with such an overall objective standard of conduct can we eliminate the public doubt that arises when—in the absence of an overall objective standard—one man is singled out and punished for improper conduct.

This resolution is not offered as a cure-all but rather as a long overdue beginning. Certainly it will take good faith and earnest concern of us all if we are to develop and implement a meaningful code of personal conduct. As a freshman Member of this body, I look to my senior colleagues for advice and counsel in this matter, so that we who are new to the House can make full use of the knowledge and experience you represent. But let us get moving—let us quit spinning our wheels. Let us get something done. Let us answer mounting public concern about the integrity of Congress with a hard-hitting, straightforward code of conduct that does the job.

As one Member of this body, I stand ready to work on this issue with any interested Member, on either side of the aisle, for as long as it takes to get this job done. And I suspect it will take determined and unrelenting effort of this kind to finally overcome the inertia and bring about this long overdue reform.

Until such time, however, as an objective code of conduct is operational, I will, as a matter of personal conviction, voluntarily file with the Clerk four annual statements for insertion into the public record.

The first voluntary statement will be full disclosure annually of my earnings and assets and I will shortly supply this statement. And I hasten to add that this is not a new idea with me. During my recent campaign for election, I voluntarily made such a complete public disclosure.

The second annual statement will certify that I have not had any relatives on my congressional payroll or working

in any other capacity, with or for, any governmental agency.

The third statement will certify that I have held no interest, personally or beneficially, in any firm that is a major supplier to Government, or in any firm that operates under direct Government charter or supervision, such as TV stations, airlines, and so forth.

The fourth statement will list all congressional travel expenses incurred by me and reimbursed by the Government.

I will make these statements available for public review because I wish to have my personal conduct in these areas above suspicion—above any lowest denominator of conduct possibly occasioned by some Member who may misuse his position of trust for his own gain.

Mr. BUSH. I would like to commend the forthright statement of the gentleman from Michigan. No Member of our group has helped more and no one has contributed more to this discussion and to the background work that went into it.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and other newly elected Republican Members of the House in urging, as strongly as we can, the appointment of a Select Committee on Ethics and Conduct and proper standards to govern this House.

This committee should recommend rules and regulations necessary or desirable to insure such proper standards of conduct—and not only by Members of the House but also by officers or employees of the House. In my judgment, such rules and regulations should include a provision prohibiting any Member of this House from employing any member of his family on his staff.

I do not think that mere disclosure of such employment is sufficient in view of the mood of this House and the recognition by many Members of the pressing need for meaningful action. I think it is also imperative in view of the mood of the country.

The committee should also be given power to make investigations of the conduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House and in my judgment should be empowered to recommend censure, suspension, or expulsion of any such Member or officer or employee after an investigation—and I wish to emphasize—after a fair and complete hearing.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Republican policy committee, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and the other newly elected Members of the Congress from the Republican Party for doing what you have done here today. I think you have done a magnificent job of pointing out the existence of a very important problem. The solution that you offer appears to me to be reasonable, honorable, and just. I think the services

that you have rendered will stand the entire House of Representatives in good stead when this very important matter comes before it for deliberation and the formation or creation of a select committee.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arizona, who is the leader of the Republican policy committee which has already issued, as most of us recognize here today, a forthright statement calling for the selection and establishment of a special Ethics Committee.

It is a great honor to have the gentleman from Arizona commend the new Members for the work they are doing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would once again urge with respect to this very important matter that the House not say it cannot be done, or this is old hat, or that it has been tried.

I urge that we take a new and fresh look at the problem, and I urge the leadership on both sides of the aisle and the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to work diligently and provide not only for the creation of an Ethics Committee, but for the adoption of a meaningful code of ethics which will show the country that we are determined to do something about this ethical cloud that hangs over this illustrious body.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a basic tenet of American democratic philosophy is the proscription that our Nation is to be a government of laws, not men. In order that Congress achieve the ultimate moral strength in its role as the crucible of American laws it must indeed also govern itself under a code of ethics which measures every Member as an equal. No American can feel secure in moral righteousness and punishment vented against any man, unless every man is governed in all respects with the same laws.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that there can be no compromise with integrity, and that includes the integrity of every Member of Congress as well as anyone else. We have all been honored by our people at home who have charged us with the awesome responsibility of representing them in the Congress of the United States. They expect us to work diligently and honestly in their behalf.

We must never reach a point where we feel that Members of Congress need not adhere to the same high standard of conduct and integrity that is expected of every man and woman in this Nation. In contrast, we should try to be a model for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a number of incidents in recent years have made the people suspicious of government. But a good share of the problem does indeed lie with the leaders of government. It is their responsibility to lead the crusade to prove to the people that the Congress and the Government of the United States will insist on absolutely honest and upright conduct by those in public service.

It is necessary for the continuance of representative government in any country, that the citizens who agree to be governed by a system of manmade

laws, have continual evidence of the practice of the highest degree of ethics. Faith in our form of government must never be taken for granted. There must be assurances and protections for U.S. citizens.

One way to help do this, Mr. Speaker, is to establish a code of ethics in Congress which will apply to every man and woman who is commissioned by the people to work here. It should be a code that will make explicit the requirements and responsibilities of the Members.

I have been honored to serve in representative government for 33 years. I hope to continue working to restore the confidence of our citizens in their Legislature. To help achieve that goal, I am proud to join with my colleagues, the newly elected Members of Congress, in this very worthy goal.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a resolution here in the House of Representatives, similar though not identical to that of my colleagues, to establish a House Committee on Ethics and to provide for full disclosure of financial holdings. The events of past weeks have reflected poorly on all Members of the House of Representatives, and, in fact, all Members of Congress. If the legislative branch is to maintain its role as a vital part of our democracy, then it must have the confidence of the American people, and we can hardly ask for or expect to receive that confidence until we are prepared to operate in the light of public disclosure.

My resolution, in addition to establishing an Ethics Committee and requiring full public disclosure of assets and indebtedness, prohibits Members of the House of Representatives from appointing or recommending for appointment any members of their family for positions on the House payroll. I feel that the recent disclosures indicating that a number of Members of Congress had relatives on their payrolls did grievous damage to the image of Congress in the eyes of the American public. Although in most instances expenditures for family members can be quite legitimate, the opportunity for misuse of public funds remains.

In recent months the concept of credibility has been challenged in the executive branch of government. Respect for the Congress has reached new lows with the disclosure of questionable practices by some of its Members. It falls, then, to the Members of this body to demonstrate to the people of the Nation that we will govern ourselves by rule of law.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, over the years a great national concern has grown about the conduct and practices of Members of Congress. Events of recent months have highlighted this concern, and, if any good can ever come from such circumstances, it will hopefully take the form of greater and continuing efforts at policing ourselves to the degree that assuming the public trust will mean exactly that. For unless we begin to police ourselves effectively, a credibility gap, at least in terms of ethics and conduct, will exist here in the legislative branch, as well as in the executive.

While I join in the introduction of a resolution calling for the establishment

of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I am convinced that our efforts in this area must attain a high degree of permanency and stability. Perhaps the establishment of a standing committee would best serve this end and develop the type of continuity necessary to treat all Members equally rather than dealing with individual controversies once they have reached the crisis stage.

Our prime goal must be public confidence. The people must not have doubts as to whether Members of this House are expected to live up to high ethical standards. The people have every right to expect their lawmakers not to be lawbreakers.

The action of a few can and will reflect on the reputation of the total. Our task must be then, to set standards for all Members so that this body, individually and collectively, will be above suspect.

It is fitting that new Members of the House are speaking out, for our mandate clearly reflects a public concern. May it not fall on closed ears. The immediate public interest and the long-range interests of Congress so demand.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, certainly the public opinion of the U.S. House of Representatives is at a low ebb. In order to counteract this fact, I believe it is necessary for us to take measures to improve the image of the House of Representatives prior to the enactment of legislation determining the future of our fellow citizens. People are entitled to know the financial interests and dealings of their elected officials, and whether any of their relatives are on the Government payroll.

Today I am introducing a resolution establishing a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee, consisting of six Members from each side of the aisle, would have the power to investigate alleged misconduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House. The resolution would also require full disclosure of assets, liabilities, gifts, and so forth, by Members of Congress, their spouses and members of their staffs. It further provides for disclosure of interests on any business dealings with or regulated by the Government, and requires a listing of relatives on the Government payroll. To enforce these disclosures the committee would design appropriate forms to be filled out by the Members, officers, and employees of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that my colleagues in the 90th Congress show to the American people that we are for integrity in Government by early passage of this resolution.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolutions which have been introduced to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House.

As we are all aware, a short-lived version of an ethics committee was established in the waning hours of the 89th Congress. Its powers, however, were severely limited by amendment. In its report to the House, issued last December, it urged that a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct be created by the House in the 90th Congress. The final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the

Congress, issued last July, also recommended the creation of such a select committee in the House. In the other Chamber a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has been in existence since 1964. The House has been derelict in its failure to follow suit.

At the beginning of this Congress the House refused to seat, pending investigation, a Member of long standing because of apparent—one is compelled to say transparent—abuse of his perquisites and privileges as a Member of the House of Representatives and chairman of an important committee. Allegations of misbehavior on the part of this Member had long been blazoned in the press, yet no investigation of his conduct was forthcoming in the House until the courts in his home State charged him with criminal contempt. This is a sad commentary on the moral conscience of one of the four most powerful governmental institutions in this country. If there had been in existence an ethics committee, empowered to investigate alleged misbehavior by Members of the House, it is certain that this unfortunate oversight would not have occurred.

Public confidence in the Congress has slipped precipitously in the last few years. To restore that confidence it is imperative that we now create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and that we give it the power necessary to insure prompt and effective action when Members of the House abuse their office. The integrity of this body and its Members must not be permitted to be compromised by the deeds of the few. An independent ethics committee is the best guarantor of this.

Mr. Speaker, opinions have been expressed that a Member once brought before such a committee would stand convicted in the public's eye even should the committee exonerate him of all allegation of misbehavior. This contention will not survive scrutiny. This Nation still believes in the innocence of the accused until guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. I see no reason why this high principle of justice will be voided because a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct might investigate a Congressman's behavior. Indeed, a "clean bill of health" from the committee should dispel the doubts and concern which might obtain about a Member's actions. To doubt this indicts the public's sense of fair play, decency, and justice. Let us remember, furthermore, that the purpose of the committee would be not to act as an inquisitor but rather as an investigator. Its purpose would be to ascertain the facts in any case, report these to the House, and recommend a course of action. We are most emphatically not creating a star chamber here.

Mr. Speaker, the entire question of ethical conduct by a Congressman is a thorny thicket. I cannot believe that any significant number of Congressmen deliberately engage in criminal, or even questionable, conduct. Nevertheless, predicaments face us at every turn. One of the most troublesome of these is the difficult and complex matter of conflict of interest. If a Member is a lawyer, for example, he may be uncertain as to which clients he, or especially the law firm with

which he may be associated, may represent in suits involved with the Government. He may own stock and find himself in a perplexing dilemma because a bill on which he should vote for the interest of his constituency also affects his own vested interests.

Then there is the matter of ex parte communications with agencies of the Government on behalf of constituents. What line may he not trespass in this regard as he attempts to hasten action. Then there is that biennial headache of campaign funds.

These are only three problems encountered by virtually every Congressman for which no adequate guides exist. The Code of Ethics passed in 1958, while a step in the right direction, simply fails to provide assistance to a Congressman in these important areas—and others. A real service would be performed by a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct if it were authorized to recommend a more explicit Code of Ethics for Members of the House with regard to these matters. I, for one, would welcome recommendations of this nature from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the force of circumstances and logic clearly support the creation of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. Temerity and not timidity is the order of the day.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined a number of my colleagues in the introduction of the ethics and disclosure bill. Passage of this legislation will provide a uniform standard by which all Members of Congress can be judged by the American people. It is our position that no duly elected individual Member of Congress should be judged against any special standard against which all Members are not ready and willing to be judged.

The bill is well conceived, Mr. Speaker, and it stands as a genuine contribution to the establishment of a uniform standard of conduct for the Members of this House. I strongly urge immediate study of and consideration on this important legislation.

This bill is identical to Mr. BUSH's.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my colleagues in support of a bill to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. The creation of this committee is vital to restore the confidence of the American people in this Congress and to insure that the present and future Congresses will warrant such confidence and respect.

The American public is entitled to expect from their elected Representatives and the officers and employees of this House, superior standards of conduct. We, as public servants, are entrusted with the responsibility of providing fair and representative government for the welfare of this great Nation. In order to do this, our behavior and conduct must be of the highest quality.

This select committee, which is similar to the one established in the 89th Congress, is desirable for the guidance and protection of Members and House employees. It has become apparent that in order for Members and employees of this House to give proper and adequate

service to the public, standards and a supervisory body must be established.

I believe that this committee, along with the standards it will establish, will provide a suitable deterrent to those who might be tempted to put personal ambition ahead of service to their country. This committee will serve as a guarantee that the Members of the House of Representatives and its employees will meet their sworn obligation to serve God and country.

Tomorrow I will introduce a resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, similar to the resolutions introduced by my colleagues. In addition to creating a Select Committee, this bill will amend the Rules of the House of Representatives by adding rule XLIII. The new rule requires that each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives will file the following information with the Clerk of the House:

First, the name and address of any business which is Government controlled or licensed in which the individual has a financial interest, second, the name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which the individual has a financial interest, and third, the name of each person employed by the U.S. Government who is a member of the family or other relative of a Member of the House of Representatives.

The responsibility is upon each of us as Members of the House of Representatives to provide such measures which will insure that all Members, officers and employees of this House will fulfill their sworn duty.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally. Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to: first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, held by them, their spouses or any staff members making more than \$15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest, either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any

Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government, and fourth, make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional pay-rolls.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this kind of gesture of honorability is desperately required at this time in our history.

The credibility gap—not only with regard to the conduct of Congressmen—has now grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue, it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of left-wing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime on the streets, to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, perhaps at no time in this century has the Congress been more sharply studied by the public gaze than the present. Perhaps at no time in recent memory has the reputation of Congress with its collective membership been subject to such popular criticism and censure as today. The tragic and thoughtless behavior of a tiny element of this House has reaped publicity of an adverse nature far in excess of the quantity of the issue. Unfortunately, all Congress is now suspect. Honest, decent, and ethical men have been forced to stand in the baleful light of mistrust that has radiated from the machinations of the few.

Our linen is now on the line. And, as long as it is there, it would be timely to apply some new detergents to the wash and give the American people a whiter and brighter deal. I am pleased to join many of my colleagues today in introducing my own package of soap in the form of an ethics and disclosure bill. Such legislation, like soap, must be more than chosen or passed upon. Ethics do not become a permanent state of affairs from the adoption of such a bill any more than laundry becomes perpetually radiant through one pass in the washer. It takes constant dedication and application to accomplish both jobs.

The bills introduced by myself and my colleagues are only a beginning. The real enforceability of congressional ethics lies in the inner person of the individual Member. The workability of

any such system lies with each of us. As with a religious creed, acceptance must be essentially voluntary in nature.

But today we may choose to begin. Today we must answer a trust, one arising from the biennial mandate of a people that have the right to expect the best from their elected representatives. We can give them no less.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues, I am introducing legislation today designed to strengthen public confidence in congressional ethics.

The current public image of Congress demands that we address ourselves to the need for tighter standards of conduct for the legislative branch of Government. Some 60 percent of those answering a recent Gallup poll said they believe the misuse of Government funds by Congressmen is fairly common. Of course, we know that such abuses are, in fact, not common, but there have been a number of such polls showing a distressing lack of public faith in the integrity of public officials. The number of identical and similar measures being introduced today demonstrates to the Nation a great desire, particularly on the part of those of us who are newly elected, for some positive steps in this important area.

I am aware that Congress does now have a code of ethics to which any person in Government service should adhere. Unfortunately, the best of codes will not provide a guarantee against occasional misbehavior by Members. Therefore, there is a need for a vehicle in the House to achieve and maintain the highest possible standards by statute with provisions for enforcement thereof. To fill this need, I am introducing legislation to amend the rules of the House in such a manner as to encourage compliance with regard to ethical conduct by compelling public disclosure of financial assets, potential conflicts of interests, and other areas in which Members or their staffs might find themselves—and, thereby, the Congress as an institution—open to public criticism.

I recognize that disclosure is a thorny problem to many of my colleagues, because public officials are also citizens with personal assets and aspirations and who quite naturally feel these matters are private in nature. However, I believe disclosure can be one more effective way to protect the integrity of elective office. As a Michigan State senator, I voted in favor of such a disclosure bill last year. Since its passage, I have found the statute not only helps insure that the public interest will be safeguarded but it can serve as a protective device for legislators against unwarranted charges leveled against them.

Personally, I do not believe it is possible to legislate morality. But it has never been more important than it is today—when we are engaged in a life and death struggle with tyranny—to maintain confidence in our governmental institutions and to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. Over the past few years, there have been several highly publicized stories of alleged misconduct by a few Members of Congress and a few employees. These escapades have hurt the collective reputation of the Congress and of its Members. Wrongdoing must

be punished and public faith in the legislative branch must be restored. I believe this legislation will go a long way toward accomplishing these objectives. We can do no less for our constituents and our country.

When an organization finds its reputation tarnished, action must be taken. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that corrective action in the form I have suggested, while not a guarantee against "bad apples in the barrel," will at least give the public its rightful opportunity to identify those apples which are less than thoroughly wholesome.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with the other Members of the 90th Congress in support of a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Events of the past few months have made it crystal clear that such a committee is needed and that the procedures and committees as presently constituted in the House are inadequate to survey the standards and conduct of the Members.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the active interest and genuine concern expressed here today by the freshman Republican Members of the 90th Congress, in this united effort to demonstrate that they are concerned about the failing image of Congress, and want to take positive, remedial action.

The Congress has demanded high standards of conduct from other Government officials, particularly members of the Cabinet. It is time that those Members who are concerned, those Members who make up the vast majority of honest and hard-working Congressmen, those Members who are striving to serve their constituents in an effective and meaningful way—it is time that these Members not only ask but demand that this House be put in order.

Mr. Speaker, that demand is being made today. It is being made not only on the floor of this House, but wherever people gather to discuss the affairs of their Nation. The concern expressed here by the new Members of Congress is reflective of a greater public feeling that the time has come to put this House in order.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, everybody's talking about crime and pointing a finger at the youth of our land as the guilty party. The phrase "juvenile delinquency" has become a frequent part of our conversation.

It is said that 20 percent of our population is 18 or below, and that 50 percent of the crime is committed by young people in this category. However, less than 5 percent of the teenagers commit the crimes. But teenagers—all of them, are labeled with this stigma.

We have something akin to this in the Congress of the United States. One Member has flaunted his disregard for the honesty and dignity of Congress, and so a cloud is cast over the whole. People do not say, one man or a few men are guilty. No, they say, "Congress—Congress is like a barrel of rotten apples, each contaminating the others."

I ask, What kind of an example is that for the youth of our land? I say, let us

clean our own house before pointing to youth and the misdemeanors and crimes of youth. We, ourselves, are on trial. Let us purge ourselves.

For this reason, I have this day introduced a bill known as the ethics and disclosure bill.

The general purpose of this bill involves five items:

First. Establish a select committee of the House called the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Second. Provide a full disclosure of assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, by Members, their spouses, and staff members, whose salaries exceed \$15,000 gross annually.

Third. Provide a full disclosure of interest, either through financial connection or kinship, with any firm practicing before any agency of the United States.

Fourth. Provide a full disclosure of interest, regardless of amount, in television and radio stations, banks, savings and loan institutions, airlines, and any other business whose right to conduct business is regulated by the Federal Government. Percentage of ownership and fair market value of interest are required for disclosure—exemption here for listed securities in this type of enterprise.

Fifth. Provide disclosure of relatives on the Government payroll, including wives, husbands, sons or daughters, grandsons or granddaughters, mothers and fathers of the Members, or his spouse.

Sixth. Require a complete disclosure form to be designed to include the second, third, fourth, and fifth items above. Also require change in clerk-hire form to require clerks to reveal relationship, if any, to Member.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, one thing that has been overlooked by the public and by Members of the House somewhat in this discussion on ethics in Government, is that one of the needs for such a committee is to improve the image of Congress. Most of us know that most Members of Congress are above reproach. As a part of discussing what would be done to eliminate violations of standards in the few instances when it may arise, it would be worth while to discuss for a minute or two, the fact that the bringing about of this committee would really establish a bill of rights for Members because the legislative history of the bringing about of this committee shows clearly the following rights would be established:

First, that, as I said in the first hearing of the Committee on Standards and Conduct, October 20, 1966:

I do not think a man's private life is detrimental to the House. No one is perfect, and if he privately has weaknesses, it should not be something that should come before this committee, as it would not reflect upon the House.

Second, that a Member is entitled to his own political views and such would not be the subject of inquiry by this committee, and no such power would be given to the committee under the proposed statute.

Third, that no trivial or frivolous matter would come before the committee, and this would be protected by the requirement that any complaint would have to be under oath and in writing,

and backed up by competent evidence, and be presented to the committee by a Member of the House, and even then, the committee would have discretion to fail to investigate it if it so decided.

Fourth, that no ex post facto hearings would be held, that is, a person could not be charged for doing something that occurred before the Congress had set up the standard by action of the full House.

Fifth, that the committee could help to make definite, realistic guides for conduct by not only helping to prohibit the bad but also by making definite what is proper, thus evading "throwing out the baby with the bathwater."

Finally, I would like to say that in my opinion, it is just as important to protect Members of Congress from being hurt by unfounded accusations as it is to root out the few isolated cases of misbehavior.

ETHICS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply encouraging to me to see the determination of our remarkable group of first-term minority Members to make a contribution toward the resolution of one of the thorniest problems facing the Congress, the question of the proper means of insuring the ethical conduct of the Members of this body. I congratulate them.

In deciding, as a group, to address themselves to this issue, our colleagues have displayed an alert sensitivity both to the moral responsibility of the House to take effective action in this field and to the proper opinion of the people we represent.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that more senior Members of this body should view with more than ordinary significance this action of our junior colleagues. Our newer Members are in a position to see this institution with somewhat greater detachment and objectivity, perhaps, than those who have served here much longer. Having been constituents themselves only a few short weeks ago, they may speak with greater authority about the attitudes of the people we represent toward Congress' long-standing reluctance to insist on the highest standards of ethical conduct.

They know, Mr. Speaker, that the people are troubled about their Congress. They recognize that when doubt and suspicion beset this representative institution, we cannot do our jobs properly. They understand that the responsibility is upon all of us—junior and senior alike—to remedy this unfortunate situation. I welcome, therefore, their sound judgment and their mature determination to act.

To elaborate somewhat on my own view of the need we face and of the

actions I believe we should take without further delay, I include as part of my remarks the text of the first of my bi-weekly radio reports in the 90th Congress, which I recorded on Wednesday, February 8:

Since this is my first broadcast of the new 90th Congress, and since we are still in the organizational stages of the new session, I was inclined to devote these remarks to a review of some of the major issues we will be facing here. There are plenty—taxes, government reorganization, air and water pollution are obvious examples. And always at issue will be the amount of money we can afford to spend for the multitude of objectives—some essential, some questionable—which earlier Congresses have authorized.

But on reflection, as a believer in priorities, I've decided that first things really should come first.

First among the first, in my judgment, is the matter of integrity, Congressional integrity. It is the foundation of representative government. It colors everything Congress does. It determines the confidence which people may have in their Government, the respect they may hold for the laws, the effectiveness with which the Government can function.

No one can disagree with the principle that all public officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. Moreover, this principle must be followed not only in reality but also in appearance. For Congress, this principle is especially important. Congressmen are the direct representatives of the people. And Congress is the source of the money and the authority on which the National Government depends.

Yet, there is an uncomfortable gap between principle and practice. Congress does not possess the unquestioned confidence or the high reputation for integrity it needs to have. People have doubts and suspicions. And much of the fault lies with Congress itself. For Congress has failed to police itself effectively. It has failed to establish clear-cut standards of conduct and to enforce these standards.

Two examples are very much in the news and they illustrate very well the problem we face. Congressman Adam Clayton Powell was denied his seat in the House on the first day of the new session, and the charges against him are now being investigated. I supported this move, but I must ask now, in common with many people, whether Congress will be content simply to dispose of the Powell case or whether it will establish the standards and machinery to assure that all its members are above reproach.

The other example is the Bobby Baker case. Mr. Baker has just been convicted on charges amounting to a violation of his trust as a former top employee of the Senate. The very evidence, however, which convicted Baker also implicated at least one former Senator in a situation involving the payment of nearly 100,000 dollars for the purpose of influencing legislation. Nothing, apparently, is being done about this.

People have a right to be bothered by unanswered questions like these. It's their government. And Congress has an obligation to the people, and to itself, to restore the people's confidence in this the highest institution of self government in our land.

Throughout my years in the House, I have repeatedly urged Congress to take the necessary action. Together with many of my colleagues, I have voted, introduced legislation, made speeches and testified before committees in efforts to bring about reform. The results, to date, have been meager, indeed. It's not because Congress doesn't know what it ought to do; rather, it has lacked the will to do it. Now, however, in the face of re-

newed scandal, we have the best opportunity so far to remedy the situation.

For the past several weeks, I have been researching this matter carefully—reviewing what has been proposed, studying the conflict-of-interest regulations of the Executive Branch, and preparing legislation which will meet the problem squarely.

I believe we need to do the following things: require the disclosure of all assets and liabilities, gifts, and business interests of Members of Congress and their top staff assistants; place on the public record all communications between Congressmen and government agencies on behalf of private interests; write a Code of Ethics which will provide specific and meaningful standards of conduct; and establish a permanent committee in the House with the power to investigate allegations of improper conduct and the power to punish offenders.

This is what my legislation will provide. If Congress enacts these laws, most of our battle will be won. And for those who persist in violating ethical standards, we will have the means of dealing with him effectively.

THE WAR ON POVERTY IN MY HOMETOWN—A STUDY IN SCHIZOPHRENIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the schizoid activities of the Johnson administration in approaching the problems of poverty make the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde relatively unimaginative. The mimeograph mills of the Great Society are constantly grinding out big slogan words like "massive attack," "bold and imaginative planning," which create the impression that poverty and the other evils which confront mankind are being rolled back before the forces of Federal law and Federal money. But when the time comes for some constructive action, I have learned from bitter experience that the Great Society frequently puts on a new face and looks the other way.

In Mexico there is a saying, "Mucho ruido, pocas nueces." Literally, it means "Much noise and few nuts." Figuratively, it means "Much talk and little accomplishment."

A rather exotic Yankee philosopher, Yogi Berra, recently stated:

You can observe quite a lot just by looking.

Well, I have been looking at all the Federal Government has done about poverty in my own hometown and I have observed quite a lot and, in my opinion, it can be best expressed with the Mexican phrase, "Mucho ruido, pocas nueces."

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to give you a concrete example, documented in fact, of the schizoid actions of the Johnson administration in the last few days in my congressional district.

To set the stage, let us first take a look at my hometown of Gilroy, Calif. We are primarily an agricultural community in an area which is almost in a different economic world than the rest of Santa Clara County. Because the fast-growing electronic and industrial

complex of northern Santa Clara County has not yet come to the Gilroy area, we will probably be required to depend upon agriculture and food processing as our economic base for a few years to come.

This dependence creates serious unemployment problems since agricultural employment is highly seasonal. Furthermore, because it is a pleasant place to live, many migratory workers who travel across the State during the summer spend their winters in Gilroy. These people are underskilled and have not been fortunate enough to have received the training which would enable them to break their migratory pattern. Their lot admittedly is not the most pleasant. There is need to help them develop skills which are in demand and at the same time to develop jobs which they can fill.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has designated Gilroy as a "pocket of poverty." Two years ago a nationally televised report by the Columbia Broadcasting System held it up as an example of poverty in the midst of affluence.

According to figures taken from the Santa Clara County Special Census of April 1966, 41.7 percent of Gilroy families have an annual income of less than \$6,000, 23.5 percent get less than \$4,000, and 8.4 percent get less than \$2,000.

The Santa Clara County Welfare Department estimated early in January that more than 1,000 families are currently on the welfare rolls in the greater Gilroy area.

The State department of employment estimates that the level of employment fluctuates wildly throughout the year, with a low employment of 1,721 to a high of 7,926.

The Federal Government sends a parade of VISTA volunteers to Gilroy to assist migratory workers. The Gilroy Area Service Center of the Economic Opportunity Commission receives comparatively heavy financing in its efforts under the poverty program.

Though I wish I could claim differently, these facts show that we do have a problem in Gilroy. Constructive Federal help would be useful and welcome in meeting our peculiar economic problem.

As the remainder of my story will show, we took the constructive steps advocated by the deluge of paper and press releases which come from the mimeograph mills of Washington. We found a means of doing something constructive. We courted one branch of Government, we were encouraged, and then we were jilted.

At the same time, another branch of the Great Society continues to pipe its tune which leads people down a road of false hope, frustration, and continued poverty.

Last fall, Swift & Co. expressed an interest in establishing a meatpacking plant near Gilroy. I talked personally with Mr. J. A. Copeland, vice president of Swift & Co., who confirmed this interest.

The meatpacking plant would immediately employ 350 unskilled laborers who would be furnished year-round employment at good wages. Here was an opportunity in one fell swoop to break the

migratory and poverty pattern of 350 human beings for all time. And the anticipated growth of Swift & Co. would undoubtedly more than double their initial employee requirements.

But Swift & Co. had to be assured that adequate utilities could be furnished, the most crucial being a sewage treatment and disposal system to handle the large discharges that come from a meatpacking plant.

This situation appeared made to order for the grant and loan program authorized by Congress and administered by the Economic Development Administration. Gilroy was encouraged to submit its application and did so. I had numerous contacts with the Seattle Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration in an effort to expedite processing of this application and received courteous and efficient replies from Mr. V. W. Cameron, the area director. At one time, Mr. Cameron wrote, and I quote:

Since the Swift and Company project involves approximately 900 new jobs, its location may have considerable impact in our evaluation of this Gilroy application.

In the meantime, Swift & Co., anxious to make its decision and proceed with the construction of its new west coast facility, patiently marked time. The Seattle office of the Economic Development Administration acted expeditiously and I was finally informed that the application had been sent forward to Washington.

At this point, the old Washington run-around started to operate and political gobbledegook and doubletalk began. Twice I was informed by Washington Economic Development Administration officials that the application was still in Seattle. Upon checking there, I found on both occasions that the information from the Economic Development Administration in Washington was false. On one occasion, I was even told the name of the lady in Washington who had the application on her desk.

I pressed further and submitted a letter written to the city manager of Gilroy by Mr. John W. Nordstrom of Swift & Co., which said in part:

We cannot definitely state that if Gilroy is given the money for this sewage disposal plant that Swift and Company would build there, but we can say that Gilroy would not be considered for this plant if a sewage disposal facility is not available.

On February 6, I wrote a letter to Mr. Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director of Economic Development, enclosing a copy of Mr. Nordstrom's letter, in which I said:

Perhaps it is too much to expect the Federal Government to make an advance commitment conditioned upon Swift's action in this case. This being true, we are then faced with the situation of which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

It is my considered opinion that a conditional commitment on the part of the Federal Government should be made and the condition should be that the grant will be approved if and when an industry is attracted to Gilroy because of the grant which would provide permanent employment to those who are presently unemployed. This would break the impasse and would certainly serve the intent, purpose, and spirit of the law.

I received various oral indications from representatives of the Economic Development Administration which strongly suggested that funds were unavailable and that though Gilroy was a pocket of poverty, the overall unemployment figures of Santa Clara County were not sufficiently high to warrant a grant. I countered with the figures from the State department of employment, the Santa Clara County Welfare Department, and the special census taken in 1966, and heard nothing further regarding the overall unemployment figures of Santa Clara County.

Finally, I received a copy of a letter from Mr. Lambert S. O'Malley, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations, Department of Commerce, addressed to the Honorable Kenneth L. Petersen, mayor of Gilroy. It said:

Since the amount of money requested is far in excess of the funds available . . . we have no choice but to limit our assistance to those projects which will do most to further the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

Although the construction of the facilities you plan would be an asset to your community, we do not see in this project any economic justification since, at this time, the Swift and Company has not made a decision with regard to locating in your area.

It is noteworthy that the denial was based upon the allegation that Swift & Co. had not made a definite decision. My suggestion for an approval conditioned upon Swift's decision was totally ignored. It is my understanding that the Economic Development Act is for the purpose of attracting industries and jobs, and not for the purpose of helping industries which would locate in an area with or without Federal assistance in building a sewage plant.

I strongly suspect that the Economic Development Administration is under wraps from the administration and is required to hold back construction of sewage facilities and similar public works projects in order to keep the economy from overheating with inflation. This explains why the administration played Alphonse and Gaston with my request and batted it back and forth between Seattle and Washington as long as it could. It explains why it proffered weak excuses which I met with facts and figures. It explains why it was finally forced to come out and say no, for a very poor reason.

We could look the world over and not find a situation which more clearly falls within the spirit and intent of the Economic Development Act. What could have provided 350 immediate jobs for the unskilled in a pocket of poverty, and eventually 900, will be lost simply because of an administrative decision.

Disappointing as the unfavorable decision might be, it would have been received much more gracefully had not information come to my desk on the same day that another branch of government was cranking up its mimeograph to announce the release of \$109,000 for the California Center for Community Development for the purpose of continuing the training of a group of people who had "graduated" from the California Self-Help Service Corps and

were now out in the field working with the poor.

Last December 30 I visited the California Self-Help Service Corps. It was located 12 miles north of Gilroy and was funded with Federal money in an amount of \$246,836. Since April of last year it has graduated 34 persons with an average third-grade education who are now working with the poor in outlying areas. These students are receiving \$400 per month and 9 cents a mile for use of their own automobiles. The director of the school is a former employee of the American Friends Service Committee. The executive research director was formerly an economist from Washington and an organizer with CORE in the Watts area. The third member of the permanent executive staff was an editor of a labor newspaper, the Valley Labor Citizen, for 11 years. Field supervisors were and are still employed to supervise the trainees in their field work with the poor. One is a teamster from Los Angeles. Another is the cousin of Cesar Chavez and still another is Fred Hirsch of San Jose, Calif., long identified with leftwing activity and a controversial individual at best.

The school was conducted in an old abandoned grammar school which had been condemned. I would not attempt to judge the quality of instruction, which included lectures from persons like the daughter of Jack London on the history of farm labor organization, officials of SNCC—Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—who spoke on SNCC's experience in the South with racial matters, and representatives of the sheriff's department and the industrial welfare department.

Though it may not be an indication of what was taught, I was rather interested to note the extensive use of wall posters and sayings which emanated from SNCC and CORE. Above the director's desk was a poster which said:

Justice is a two-edged sword—but it is always sharper on one side than the other

Another said:

Lord, if you would make me in your image, you must be an agnostic.

And another said:

We're going to tear this country up, then we're going to build it back, brick by brick, until it is a fit place for human beings.

Still another said:

If the courts don't kill a man after he is convicted of committing a crime, what right does a cop have to kill him on suspicion?

For no explained reason, a picture of Red Chinese Defense Minister Lin Pao, cut from the cover of a magazine, was prominently displayed on the bulletin board. Another poster put out by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee showed a picture of a stern-faced Mississippi highway patrolman above the caption: "Is he protecting us?"

Some area citizens have called this school an agitation academy and, judging from what little I saw, it is possible they are correct.

One fact is certain—it has cost about \$7,260 for each of the original 34 community service representatives who graduated.

As I have said previously, on the same day that the Economic Development Administration denied a loan for a sewage treatment plant to Gilroy, which would have eventually provided employment for 900 individuals, the Office of Economic Opportunity released an additional \$109,000 to continue the work of the self-help service corps so that 30 of its graduates may continue their work in the field.

And what type of work are they doing?

According to the gentleman who talked to me when I visited the self-help service corps center, they are participating in self-help housing programs—violently opposed in some quarters by the building and construction trades unions. They are conducting citizenship education and in Modesto they are helping to organize welfare recipients and equip them to be better able to secure all their rights.

Thus, at the end of the current grant, which is to be spent on 30 of the original 34 graduates, we will have approximately another \$3,633 invested in each of the trainees. Each of the 30 now represents a taxpayers' investment of more than \$11,000.

Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty continues to flounder. The Headstart program and the Neighborhood Youth Corps program have achieved a degree of success, but the former properly belongs under the direction and administration of the U.S. Office of Education and local school systems. The latter should be under the administration of the Department of Labor, administered through State departments of employment. The Office of Economic Opportunity is hiding behind the skirts of a successful Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps program and continuing to throw money around in improperly planned, proliferated efforts which lack coordination and commonsense. I believe that with the above exceptions it is achieving nothing except to excite false hopes and create frustrations in the poor. Furthermore, as I have repeatedly stated in the past, I believe the program is being utilized as a base of political operations for those ultraliberal persuasion.

Mr. Speaker, the series of events I have related, though they affect only a small locality within this Nation, could be typical of what is going on everywhere. They raise a very serious question as to the sincerity of the Johnson administration. Does the administration really want to get at the causes of poverty and give people the dignity and pride of holding a steady job, or do they only want to build bureaus and political bases of power, hire topheavy bureaucracies, and train people to agitate rather than work?

I suppose I am being provincial, but, frankly, I feel sorry for the migrant workers of my hometown who lost their chance for a better life last Thursday, while the poverty program continues to train more paid agitators to tell them how bad is their lot.

Mr. Speaker, this does not make sense and the American people know it. This Congress should do something about attacking the real root of poverty. Let us train people to want jobs—to hold them—and let us do things which will create jobs.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL CREDIT SYSTEM REVIEW

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the overstress on monetary policy, as opposed to fiscal action, which caused such grief in our Nation's economic system last year, has made us all more aware of the credit functions of both public and private bodies. The possibility that our present credit system is simply not structured to handle this type of stress has been raised in an excellent and concise statement of the problem by Milford A. Vieser, chairman of the finance committee for the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

In his comments on January 23, 1967, to the Newark chapter of the Finance Executive Institute, Mr. Vieser noted that a multiplicity of Federal Government credit operations has sprung up beyond the control of the Federal Reserve. Far more important, as Mr. Vieser points out, is the impact of increased Government spending, coupled with borrowing and lack of fiscal restraint, which has created an unfavorable interaction between the price structure and the credit structure.

Mr. Vieser brings out the fact that our budget is not only increasing in amount, but number of outlays each year. He calls for a more straightforward method of Federal budgeting, an all-inclusive method of coordinated Federal appropriating procedures, and a simplification of the Federal administrative structure through a new Hoover Commission-type study. The latter has been recommended by many Members of Congress, including myself, in legislation this year.

Of primary importance, he notes the need to set priorities. The questions he raises are worth asking and repeating. Do we have to get to the moon in 1968 or could we better use some of the billions in meeting the challenge of slums and urban problems? Does the supersonic airplane have priority over moving millions on the ground through mass transportation? We must find a means to rationally answer these questions.

In addition, Mr. Vieser poses areas of investigation and study dealing with the supply of private credit and the institutions so far created for this task. All in all, I have found Mr. Vieser's remarks to be a unique contribution to a necessary dialog on the credit problem, and I commend them to my colleagues for their serious consideration.

The statement of Mr. Vieser follows:

THE AMERICAN CREDIT SYSTEM—ORDER OR DISORDER

(Statement by Milford A. Vieser, chairman of the finance committee, the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., before the Newark Chapter of the Finance Executives Institute, Newark, N.J., January 23, 1967)

The year 1966 will be memorable in financial history as the year in which our credit

structure was subjected to greater strain than it had known since the late 1920s.

While the strain will probably be less in the present year, the strain of last year will, I fear, be transmitted into sectors of the economy other than simply those comprising financial institutions. While I am not forecasting a deep recession, I believe that the time is at hand when we must make a thoroughgoing review of our credit structure in all its complex ramifications—government and private—to make sure that we avoid even the possibility of such a disaster.

The reason for the severe strain we experienced last year, the reason we shall not be without some this year, and the reason that we must remove the sources of excess strain is that the structure of our credit system is not designed to cope with the stresses imposed upon it. These stresses have been created not only by the growth and variety of private credit demands, but by a dramatic expansion of governmental activity that involves both the demand for credit for its own purposes and the extension of credit to meet the needs of a variety of private claimants.

Let us reflect on the background of the situation in which we find ourselves. The last major revision of our federal banking laws was in 1935. This was a revision made in the midst of catastrophe. It was made in haste to meet and finally to overcome a disaster. Consequently, it was a backward rather than a forward-looking revision, designed to restore confidence, and to get the financial machinery of the nation functioning as rapidly as possible. It did not anticipate the vast changes in credit demands that the nation has experienced since that time. In fact, it did not look beyond the needs of the moment. It was like reinforcing a levee in the midst of a flood rather than controlling the flow at the headwaters where the flood had started.

Prior to the great depression, the involvement of the federal government in the credit structure was extremely limited. It chartered and supervised national banks; it had established the Federal Reserve System in 1914, and the Federal Land Bank System a short time after, and that was about it. The federal government was not itself a direct source of credit for the purposes of either individuals or local governments. Following the collapse of the early 1930s, however, came a sudden multiplication of new agencies which affected the flow of credit and, for the most part, acted independently of the banking system and the controls of the Federal Reserve.

Among these new credit instrumentalities were the RFC, HOLC, FDIC, FHA, FNMA and many others. All of these used federal funds or pledged the credit of the federal government. Their establishment resulted from no set policy and from no objective other than to get this or that sector of the economy into working order. Little account was taken of their effect upon the nation's financial structure as a whole.

A few of these agencies have been terminated; but many have survived, undergoing in the course of time revisions designed to meet new emergencies, and new agencies have been created to serve new needs. And so we have the CCC, SBA, the Export-Import Bank, and many others, the total adding to around 75 wholly separate federal government operations dispensing loans for a great variety of purposes, to a great variety of borrowers, including interest rates determined by a great variety of criteria, usually with the idea of circumventing the forces of the financial markets. The amount committed by these operations is expected to exceed \$36 billion in the 1966-67 fiscal year. The total of these activities obviously becomes in itself a force in the financial market.

Although the federal government's credit operations bear heavily upon general credit conditions, they are beyond the control of

the Federal Reserve. Therefore, monetary policy, unable to control these extra-market credit operations, must adapt itself to absorb their impact.

These although troublesome, comprise the smaller part of the impact which the operations of the federal government have on money and credit conditions. The major source of our credit difficulties comes from the mounting cost of government itself. This finds its expression not only in pressures directly on the credit structure as the result of deficit financing, but also in the strain it has created on the nation's resources of materials and labor and, through that, on the price structure. The price inflation of 1965 and 1966, as well as that still threatened, has been mainly caused by this pressure. One evidence is that the gains in the gross national product throughout 1966 were steadily larger for government purchases of goods and services and steadily less for private spending.

As a nation we have been trying to do more than it is feasible to do in such a hurry. The enormous expansion of federal participation in welfare and educational activities, the rising cost of our ventures into outer space, the emergence of new forms of subsidy for urban development and transportation—all at a time in which we are engaged in what can no longer be called a little war—have produced strains that are clearly reflected in an unfavorable interaction between the price structure and the credit structure.

This has resulted from two basic factors. First, the federal government's rising demand for funds has required it to go to the market in 1966 for \$9 billion net new Treasury obligations and about \$1 billion in FNMA participations which are merely a delusive way of raising funds for government purposes. This has put pressure directly on a market crowded by a record expansion in private plant and equipment financing and in local government borrowing. Second, because of the absence of fiscal restraint by the federal government, it has been necessary for the monetary authorities to combat the inflationary trend by constricting the money supply and restraining bank credit.

Out of this combination have come the closest thing to a financial crisis since 1932, the highest interest rates in more than forty years, a disruption in the competitive relationships of institutional investors, and a sharply and unequally curtailed availability of credit, which was especially—though not exclusively—adverse to the market for home mortgages. And so, in this troubled year, we have a flood of demands and suggestions for improving the flow of funds from existing channels and for tapping new sources of funds.

While some of these suggestions may have merit, they do not go to the root of the distortions that cause this ferment. If we concentrate on the usual and expedient proposals that arise from this ferment we shall at best do another patch-up job, and more likely create further distortions rather than eliminate those we already have.

The root of our present distortions is in the framework and the policy, or lack of policy, in the federal government's fiscal and monetary operations. To get to the root, however, it is necessary to face up to these facts.

The federal budget is out of control.

The federal budget is out of control because each year federal outlays both rise in amount and increase in variety. This is not necessarily by design, but results from a mass of conflicting claims and a host of authorizations for lending activities, many of which are carried on outside the regular appropriations procedures. This situation exists irrespective of the Vietnam conflict, although it is greatly complicated by it.

Because the budget is out of control, the task of determining and of implementing an appropriate tax policy becomes difficult, and

consequently, the burden of economic adjustment falls too heavily upon monetary policy.

Our means and methods of exercising monetary policy in themselves may be antiquated.

What is the answer? The noted architect, Louis Sullivan, worked on the principle that the solution of a problem is inherent in its statement. In our case, if the problem is that the budget is out of control, the solution plainly is to get it under control. By this we do not mean turning out the lights in the White House or otherwise trimming around the edges of the problem. New methods of compiling and reviewing the budget must be developed, and some means be devised for coordinating appropriations procedures and for assuring that all types of federal outlays be subject to them. In short, the budget must be an all-revealing budget. Backdoor spending must be ended, the granting of long-range obligational authority should be curtailed wherever possible, and unused outstanding authorizations should certainly be subject to annual review.

Equally important with these needs is that for simplification of function. If ever an organization could use the services of a management expert, it is the federal government. The Hoover Commission of 1948 to 1955 undertook the task of reviewing the federal structure, but only part of its many excellent recommendations were acted upon. Since then the cross-jurisdictional and general confusion have become much greater. The War on Poverty, notwithstanding its excellent intentions, appears to be an administrative nightmare. Matters related to urban renewal as recent hearings have disclosed, are spread over 70 agencies and involve over 200 separate programs. Transportation, in spite of the creation of a new cabinet post, is still under at least half a dozen jurisdictions. As a result, we have reached the point where another Hoover-type study is urgently called for and this time its recommendations would be neglected only at the risk of fiscal chaos beyond that which we now have, if that is possible.

Both better budgeting methods and greater simplicity are vital to getting the budget under control. But they do not go fully to the most vital questions of all: Is a given activity a necessary one for the federal government? If so, how does it stand in the range of priorities?

Questions like these must be kept constantly in mind by every private business and every family. Neither business man nor householder can ignore them except at the peril of insolvency. Only the most reckless and improvident assume they can have everything they want without delay, and the wise ones know there are some things they may never have at all. Government can no more avoid the consequences of failure to sort out needs in relation to present and prospective resources and to set a scale of importance and a schedule of timing for them than can you or I. What happened last year has demonstrated this, and we shall be lucky if the years ahead do not carry the demonstration painfully further.

The strongest and mightiest nation in the world cannot meet all goals at once. A responsible government must therefore begin to think in terms of priority. It must take seriously such questions as: Can we ignore the drain of war on our resources when we plan for needed improvements in the social and physical aspects of our country? Can we launch a multi-billion-dollar anti-missile program concurrently with a multi-billion-dollar expansion of medicare? Do we have to get to the moon in 1968 or could we better use some of the billions to eliminate the still festering slums of our cities? Do we have to spend billions in order to beat some rival nation to the production of a supersonic airplane, when billions are urgently needed to improve mass transportation in our cities? These questions must be asked, and we must

find the means for answering them wisely if we are ever to approach rationality and prudence in our fiscal policy. While we are reviewing federal institutions and fiscal policies, we should also take a fresh look at our private credit institutions. Our credit system has grown infinitely more complex than it was in 1908 when Senator Aldrich of Rhode Island began the inquiry that six years later led to the formation of the Federal Reserve System.

Since that time, a whole system of institutions for dispensing agricultural credit has been created. Savings and loan associations, from a small group mainly of neighborhood self-help organizations, have become a major medium for savings and a major force in the financial market. Credit unions have now begun to follow a similar course. Mutual savings banks, originally motivated by philanthropy, have become important sources of investment funds. Life insurance companies are vastly more influential in the direction that economic expansion will take than they were 60 years ago. And the commercial banks themselves, which virtually were the financial system when the Federal Reserve was first contemplated, have multiplied the ways in which they affect the flow of credit beyond anything that Senator Aldrich could have imagined.

All this growth and multiplication have happened in response to recognition of special credit needs and to the ingenuity of individuals and government in meeting them. In many respects, they have served their purposes well; and, merely because their functioning has been disrupted by unusual conditions, we need not conclude that their ability to continue to serve these purposes has been forever impaired.

Nevertheless, we need to take a longer view and to measure our institutional savings structure against the enormous demands for credit that will face us in the years ahead. Does our present structure in fact measure up? Should we differentiate more clearly between the commercial banking function and the function of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks? Or should we be moving toward a system of all-purpose institutions, for at present we certainly can see a tendency toward a blending of function. Should we not review the present system of branches for our commercial banking and savings institutions to permit greater service to our people in places of substantial population growth? Some states confine banking to municipal boundaries. Others confine their financial institutions to county boundaries which no longer represent a commuting or economic area. What should be the criteria for mergers of financial institutions?

The answers to such questions will be found only through such an exhaustive inquiry as that instituted by Senator Aldrich and finally completed under the guidance of Carter Glass. This time we should avoid emergency answers and waste no time in getting down to root issues.

This is a large order. You may think that it is too big an order, including as it does a straightforward method of federal budgeting; an all-inclusive method of coordinating federal appropriating procedures; a simplification of the federal administrative structure; a method of evaluating federal activities and establishing priorities among them; and a thoroughgoing review of our credit system and of the institutions of which it is composed.

Large as the order is, it is not too large to attempt or too large to achieve. The American people have demonstrated their ingenuity and ability to fulfill larger orders than this.

But this large order will not be solved unless action is taken, and action will not be taken until people like you and me throughout the country fully realize the nature of the problem and the need for its solution and impress upon our nation and

our representatives the necessity for action. We must take a long, deep look, jointly by government and the private financial sector of the economy itself.

Trite though it may sound, the objective of such action must be a sound fiscal and credit policy. In spite of all the recent scolding of the "Puritan ethic" of caution and discretion as applied to government, government can no more escape the penalties of improvidence than can private companies and individuals.

We may take warning that, throughout history, strong nations and civilizations have collapsed because they failed in reaching that objective. In the light of this warning and with the readiness we have always shown in meeting a challenge once it is recognized, we may have confidence that the questions that confront us now, numerous and puzzling though they be, can and will be answered.

GOOD AIR USE MANAGEMENT NEEDED

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, reduction in air pollution is a subject which is occupying the attention of deeply concerned people in every part of the country. One who has long been studying this problem is James L. Dallas, of Beverly, Mass., sanitary engineer in charge of the air use management program of the bureau of environmental sanitation of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

Contending that good air use management programs, not just air pollution control programs, are needed in the United States, Mr. Dallas ably discussed this subject during a panel session of the Engineering Societies of New England on February 21, 1967, at the Sheraton Plaza Hotel in Boston. Because of the broad interest I believe his message contains, I wish to submit the text of his remarks, as follows:

ON AIR USE MANAGEMENT

(By James L. Dallas)

I would like to discuss briefly a few observations relative to air use and air quality control.

In so-called "air pollution control programs," government should strive to keep in balance its efforts to reduce air contamination and its sufficiency of reasonable use of its air (as a resource) to receive (and transport away) certain wastes resulting from man's individual and collective activities. Such use, however, must be in a manner compatible with but to an extent no greater than the capability of the ambient (outdoor) air to tolerate such use without undue detriment to man and his environment of concern. Expensive air pollution control measures for the preservation of pristine purity of air, for preservation reasons alone, and where lack of such would produce no significant hazard to man or to those elements in the environment for which man has a real concern, is *per se* a waste of a valuable resource—contradictory as it may seem, air manifests itself as a resource through use—it cannot be hoarded. A drop of water, which falls as rain on land, runs downhill into a river and back unused, to the ocean, is lost for use as nature's fresh water until it returns as an entirely new

drop of rain in nature's cycle. So also is air wasted if not used. Air exists as a resource partly through its capability to receive a limited amount of dirt and by means of natural phenomena, cleanse itself. The phenomena of self-purification and constituent rejuvenation is the resource; prudent utilization of these phenomena while maintaining an air quality satisfactory to a democratic society, is desirable. Good air use management programs, not just air pollution control programs, are indicated.

To properly manage air use, we must be custodian of the ambient air, we must monitor its quality and inventory its corruption, we must constantly evaluate its air contamination absorption potential (which is weather dependent), and we must apply the art of air pollution control when and where indicated for the benefit of man.

As a public health official I am, of course, primarily concerned with the problem of protecting the health of the citizens. I am aware, however, that a good air use management program must address itself also to the commonwealth and economic well-being of its citizens. The attainment and maintenance of economic well-being requires the husbandry of industry, but as such must not be at the expense of "mal air" (i.e., air of unacceptable quality). The ambient air over a state represents a resource capability which varies from place to place, in its volume, climate, meteorological patterns, geographical location, and place or places of origin. These variations determine the relative worth to a state of its "ambient air heritage" and the uses to which its air can be put under a balanced air use management program. The ambient air over a state is therefore a resource which varies in value from state to state (and from place to place within a state) just as do mineral, land, water, climatological, or other resources. It is a resource which a state has a right to zealously guard, protect, and use competitively with other states to its advantage as it does with its other resources. A state should have a right to receive air from adjacent states in reasonably good quality and likewise should have a responsibility to discharge air across its borders to sister states in equally reasonably good quality. Standards for this "reasonably good quality" for interstate air have not yet been established but to be fair such standards must provide a reserve capacity for potential air use by the receiving state so that, after a degree of reasonable use, the quality of the air would still meet the ambient air quality criteria of that (the receiving) state. However, a state's particular geographic location, (e.g. adjacent to an ocean or large body of water such as in the case of Hawaii) may afford it apparent advantage, and great latitudes in its air use management program and in the indicated requisite quality of its effluent air.

The deas and concepts that I have been discussing are some that should affect legislation and the manner of implementation of air use management programs. They should influence the design and oversight of such programs at local, regional, state, inter-state, and federal levels.

STATE PROGRAMS

We know how to legislate for, regulate, and institute state air pollution control programs; such are simple exercises in well established governmental and public health administrative practices and procedures. Massachusetts already has excellent enabling legislation, and its programs and potential programs are recognized as among the best in spite of budget and staffing problems. We have municipal, multi-municipal regional, and state wide programs operational under the aegis and direct supervision of the Department of Public Health.

A major and continuing problem to air use management officials, however, is and will be that of determining the appropriate kind of and amount of use to which air resources

may be put. The difficulty arises in determining the proper balance between control and reasonable use. A clue to the solution to the problem may, however, be found in the name: "Commonwealth of Massachusetts." The word "commonwealth" means "general welfare" and also it means "the body of people constituting a politically organized community." These in turn suggest that perhaps the point of balance should be determined for the maximum benefit of society with due regard for the public health, comfort, and convenience, and the rights of individual and group interests.

To accomplish this, the public must be educated in the why and ways as well as the costs, direct and indirect, of air pollution and of its control. The hazards to health and other deleterious effects of air pollution must be determined and made known to the people. The courts must be educated in air pollution matters so that they can make just decisions in cases involving the reasonableness of enforcement measures. Polluters of the environment must act responsibly and be held responsible for their actions. Legislators must act as statesmen and not political opportunists and control officials must be provided with a "crystal ball" to guard them against attempting "too little too late or too much too soon".

As you may see, State Air Pollution Control Programs have developed into sophisticated and complex programs of "Air Use Management" in which no single area of concern can be totally satisfied at the expense of any or all others. Control officials, industry, the general public, the news media, and elected officials have a responsibility to become acquainted with the state of the art of air pollution control, the real significance of air contamination, and the benefits vs the risks of air pollution controlled or uncontrolled before making potentially unreasonable demands, one upon another.

INTERSTATE APC

As for interstate air pollution control, I believe this problem should be handled by the Federal Government through an *air quality assurance program*. In such a program reasonable acceptable minimum air quality standards for air passing from one state to another should be established and guarantees of such quality provided by the Federal Government. These standards must be determined *first*, on the basis of health requirements and *second*, on the basis of reasonable use by the discharging state with due regard for potential air borne waste dispersal needs of the receiving state. For some long lived pollutants, the standard would therefore be a fractional portion of its acceptable ambient air quality criteria concentration.

Further, it should be recognized that the size of a state, its geographic location, weather patterns, and proximity to an ocean (whereby the effluent air may at times discharge to the ocean instead of an adjacent state) are vagaries of fortune which, like other resources, may occasion certain benefits to some states. Such states should not be denied the beneficial use of such circumstances.

FEDERAL

Under the clean air act, a state can request the federal government to provide relief for a condition of air pollution resulting in its state but caused by a source in a sister state. The responsibility of a state to maintain its effluent air of suitable quality should be recognized. The federal government, in assuring interstate air quality, should address its abatement order to the offending state which should then take appropriate action. Federal intervention should come only upon failure of the offending state to act.

The federal government should not be allowed to arbitrarily impose its whims upon a group of states through the formation of "Air Shed" regions as suggested recently by

the President. Such federalism usually results in bureaucratic uniformity of regulation, and administration with ease of implementation thereof as the guide for action. I give you, for example, nationwide automobile exhaust control to be required by federal law on all 1968 models to be sold in the United States regardless of demonstrated need in the state where sold, e.g. Alaska.

The federal government can best, and most appropriately should, encourage research in both control measures and control program techniques, help standardize evaluation procedures, assure satisfactory interstate air quality, provide technical assistance to the states, disseminate accurate information on the status of air pollution and administer federal financial assistance programs. Resources necessary and available to the federal government should be used by the U.S. Public Health Service to establish and keep up to date ambient air quality criteria and information on the significance of such criteria.

INTERSTATE COMPACT PROGRAMS

Interstate-Compact Air Pollution Control Programs would then be indicated only in those instances where a mutual desire for either a *higher* or *lower* degree of ambient air quality than that assured by the federal government existed. Such a program should be entered into voluntarily by the states concerned and not arbitrarily imposed upon them by the federal government. By special consent a state which does not need a specific air pollution absorption capability in the air it receives, could grant special privileges to its neighbor state.

These then, I believe, are a few important ideas which should be weighed and considered by all people involved in the air pollution problem. The people involved are: the lay public and the control officials, industry and the man on the street, the consultant and his client, the individual and organizations such as service clubs and the Air Pollution Control Association, and, yes, even elected officials including the President.

ASHBROOK CALLED TURN IN 1963

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor of this House on March 2, 1963, when my colleague, JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, spoke before this body to discuss the irregularities of ADAM POWELL in reporting official expenses of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] served as chairman and on which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] served as a member. I include in the body of today's RECORD an article by Jack Steele in the Columbus Citizen-Journal, on Monday, February 27, 1967:

POWELL CASE: ASHBROOK CALLED TURN IN 1963

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON.—If the House had paid attention to Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-O.) back in 1963, it might have avoided the present hassle over seating Adam Clayton Powell. Ashbrook, in a House speech on March 12, 1963, accused Powell of falsifying an official expense report he had filed with the House on a 1962 junket to Europe.

This was Powell's notorious six-week jaunt to London, Paris, Venice, Rome, Athens, Delhi and other watering places with two

women members of his staff, beauty-queen Corrine Huff and Mrs. Tamara J. Wall.

The three had luxuriated at London theaters, Paris nightclubs and at a beachhouse in Greece.

Ashbrook charged that Powell had drawn far more in foreign currencies from the State Department to finance the junket than he had reported spending to the House.

Powell ignored his charges.

The State Department refused to divulge how much it had turned over to Powell and his companions in foreign currencies—most of it counterpart funds generated by the foreign aid program.

The House Administration Committee, which now aspires to serve as the guardian of congressmen's ethics, disclaimed any responsibility for checking up on Powell's travel expenses.

The House collectively yawned.

Now—nearly four years later—the special House committee which investigated Powell's fitness to be seated finally has confirmed that Ashbrook's charges were correct.

The committee's report disclosed that Powell and his two fellow travelers collected \$10,607 in foreign currencies from the State Department for their 1962 European junket.

But they reported to the House that they had spent less than half this on the trip—\$4938. The report does not say what happened to the rest of the money.

The committee dug into Powell's foreign trips because one of its members, Rep. Vernon W. Thomson (R-Wis.) remembered Ashbrook's charges and demanded that State Department records be subpoenaed, if necessary, to check on them.

The records show that in the years 1961 through 1964 Powell drew \$13,614 in foreign currencies for his own trips abroad and listed only \$6902 in expenses in his reports to the House.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXIV: THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, at the House Armed Services Committee hearings last June, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], asked General Hershey if the percentage of qualified Negroes drafted was higher than that of qualified non-Negroes. The Director of the Selective Service responded:

No; I don't think so, because in the first place the population is somewhere around 11 or 12 percent, so that leaves in all other groups about 88 percent and I doubt very seriously that the 88 percent isn't furnishing a higher percentage, relatively, than the 12 percent.

The results of a study of the draft figures for 1965, however, dispute General Hershey's thoughts on this matter: 1,037,788 whites were given preinduction examinations; 630,592 were found acceptable—60.7 percent of those examined; 194,696 were drafted—30.8 percent of those found acceptable; 163,425 nonwhites were given preinduction examinations; 47,792 were found acceptable—29.2 percent of those examined; 29,608 were drafted—61.9 percent of those found acceptable.

While it is convenient to cite the fact that the percentage of nonwhites who are conscripted, and this essentially means the Negro, at times may approximate the percentage of Negroes in our population, the significant fact is that a smaller proportion of Negroes meet the physical and mental standards for induction, and of these, a larger proportion are drafted.

Statistically, then, the Negro qualified for induction stands twice as great a chance of being drafted as does the white who is qualified for military service.

SOUTH AFRICA MUST RE-EXAMINE ITS RACIAL POLICIES

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the strict segregation of the races that is attempted by the Government of South Africa is bringing it more problems every day.

The Christian Science Monitor for February 17 points out that South Africa must "find the will and the means to bring all of its inhabitants, regardless of color, into a fuller participation in all aspects of national life."

I commend this editorial to the attention of other Members of the House.

NEW DILEMMA IN SOUTH AFRICA

A dispatch to this newspaper from Cape Town recently revealed another of the serious difficulties facing the Republic of South Africa. In its efforts to increase the white percentage of the population, the government has been encouraging European immigration. Now, however, there is a rising demand from within the Afrikaans-speaking community that such immigration be halted. And the reason? Because most of the newcomers were found to be joining the English-speaking sector, arousing fear among the Afrikaners that their present firm grip on the government might some day be swept away.

Thus the government finds itself in a cleft stick. On the one hand the white population (both Afrikaans- and English-speaking) came to less than one in every five South Africans in the 1960 census. Furthermore, the nonwhite majority (black Africans, Cape Coloureds, and Indians) has a far higher birthrate than the whites. Therefore, if there is no immigration, the whites will become a smaller and smaller minority year by year.

On the other hand, the Nationalist government has clearly found it impossible to find adequate sources of immigration (the most likely being German and Dutch Protestants) who can be expected to meld with the Afrikaner portion of the white population. Thus any other kind of white inflow raises its own threat to Nationalist sway—that of seeing English-speaking whitedom take over the running of the country.

This dilemma is but one of the forces which will inevitably force the Republic of South Africa into a thoroughgoing reexamination of its basic racial policies. It becomes increasingly apparent that the fundamental need is for that land to find the will and the means to bring all of its inhabitants, regardless of color, into a fuller participation in all aspects of national life.

This is an inescapable obligation, as the increasing contradictions of any other course of action show.

THE ROLE OF THE CIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure of the secret relationship between the CIA and several private organizations and of certain USIA activities has prompted considerable public discussion as to the proper role of these two groups.

Edward P. Morgan, news commentator for ABC, has expressed some penetrating observations on the dangers he sees in allowing these types of activities to continue.

I have unanimous consent to have these comments printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1967.

According to the late George Orwell, the brilliant and iconoclastic British writer, Big Brother was not supposed to take over until 1984. But thanks to the assiduous stupidity of the Central Intelligence Agency and the well- if covertly-budgeted activities of other do-gooder bureaucracies within the U.S. government, the realization of that happy day of total domination of a citizen's life by higher authority may be hastened by a full 10 years if, indeed, it is not already upon us. This may come as a surprise to the Kremlin which had been under the impression that it was unchallenged in totalitarian pursuits. The jarring realization that the Americans are not only in the running but could conceivably claim the laurels is almost enough to blight the 50th anniversary celebration of the Bolshevik revolution which the Russians are now preparing for October. But after all, that's the risk the Marxists run in trying to compete with a free society which has a budget so big that it can afford to produce, not only color television sets but campus scholarships, in effect, for training in the arts of subversion and espionage, without really knowing what it is doing.

Ah, there's the rub—without really knowing what it is doing. No master demon is actually sitting in Washington conspiring to brainwash the American people and rob them of their rights. Nevertheless, this insidious operation is underway before our very eyes and we hardly know it is happening. It is not too late to understand what is going on and reverse it. But this involves a realization of what well-intentioned officials can do, are doing and have done, with budgets that have become bigger than the average mind can comprehend, and with the unquestioned purpose of furthering the national interest. But who defines the national interest these days?

The Defense Department has asked for 73 billion dollars to protect it. Inevitably, in spending that much money the Pentagon puts its own interpretation on the national interest, which bidders for defense contracts are not likely to challenge too sharply. The CIA's budget is chicken feed by comparison. It is secret but the New York Times in a revealing series on the agency last year estimated it as upward of half a billion. Even at current prices, that will feed a lot of chickens.

The trouble is now another CIA turkey has come home to roost. Eclipsing its ex-

pose last spring of how a Michigan State University project for training Vietnamese police had become a front for the agency, an irreverent monthly magazine called Ramparts now reveals this: The CIA for about 15 years has been subsidizing the international staff of the biggest, most moderate and most "respectable" campus organization in the country, NSA, the National Student Association. How patriotic, how appropriate, how economical! Teach red-blooded young Americans how to spot a revolutionary at a World Youth Congress, then let these budding James Bonds come back and report. There is, in fact, great merit in briefing youth on the sinister facts—and they can be sinister—of international political life. But the place for this is not in some secret school for Junior G-men but openly, in public and private education.

The ghastly trouble now is that the public doesn't really know whether some university training project is being secretly financed. Just as the Michigan State-CIA liaison was being revealed, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with reluctance and embarrassment, publicly severed its ties with the agency which had helped establish, with a \$300,000 grant, MIT's Center of International Studies in 1951. With six million dollars to spend, the U.S. Army hired a special task force from American University in Washington to conduct a secret study of revolutionary situations in Latin America in 1965. Fortunately it was exposed and blew up before it did much diplomatic damage. Even earlier educators were debating the dubious merits of disguised federal support for special "education" projects. How can you fertilize academic freedom if the administration is not free to say why or whence the cash is coming?

The New York Times revealed two Sundays ago that ROTC cadets in seven western states have been given "confidential instruction that association with certain political organizations could endanger their being granted a commission." An interesting military invasion of a civilian province which the Defense Department confirms. The U.S. Information Agency in the past has secretly contracted with authors to write books, whose federal sponsorship was not known. The USIA has lamely complained that only a "few" such instances were involved.

Why don't the master minds in the CIA, the Pentagon, the USIA and elsewhere in government stop to think sometimes what their pretty plans are likely to do to the very free institutions they are supposed to be helping protect? The CIA found the virginal Peace Corps almost irresistible but President Kennedy extracted Director Allen Dulles' solemn pledge its honor would not be violated with spies. Presumably it remains pure as the driven snow but the CIA seduction of the NSA now unfairly raises insidious doubts.

In George Orwell's book "1984" Big Brother's one-party system has three slogans: "War is Peace," "Freedom is Slavery," and "Ignorance is Strength." They'd sound pretty good, wouldn't they, under government subsidy?

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

THE TRICK IS PEOPLE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a pene-

trating analysis of the process necessary for modernizing society in the developing nations was presented last weekend by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse].

His emphasis on the strategy and techniques for involving people in running their own affairs deserves careful reading by all Members as a basis for shaping foreign aid legislation for fiscal 1968.

The remarks follow:

THE TRICK IS PEOPLE

(Remarks of Congressman F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts, before the conference on "Societal Change in Developing Countries: Alternatives to Revolution" Institute of International Relations, Stanford University, February 24-26, 1967)

It is most impolite for a guest to criticize the topic of his host's conference. Nevertheless, I feel I must take issues with the "Alternatives to Revolution" portion of the conference theme, for I am convinced that there is no alternative to revolution. The problem for the developed and the developing society alike is to encourage that revolution to be a quantitative increase in political effectiveness rather than a cycle of violence, coup and instability.

The deficit in our thinking about development has been that we have concerned ourselves principally with but one aspect; economics. Increasingly we are discovering that this is inadequate. It is not enough merely to provide more economic resources. This must be done, of course, but more money, more dams, more transportation networks will not in themselves bring about the broad-gauge development that is necessary to put the developing societies into the 20th century as effective nations.

We must give equal attention to the development of human resources, in short, with political development. Because as John Plank of the Brookings Institution has put it, "political development in the last analysis is something that occurs in individuals."

It is time to stand some of the traditional theories about development on their heads. One need look only at Germany of the 1930's and South Africa today to demonstrate that economic progress does not necessarily lead to political enlightenment. Fortunately, there is evidence, of which this conference is a leading example, of a new interest and attention to the political dimension of development.

Another evidence is the enactment of a new Title IX in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. The text of Title IX is short and simple. It provides that "emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation through the encouragement of private voluntary organizations and strengthened local government institutions." Both elements are virtually unknown in much of the developing world.

The co-author of Title IX, Congressman Donald Fraser of Minnesota, has stated the thrust of the legislation this way: "The Problem of the developing nation requires attention to the social and political structures. These must be changed to release the energies—where they exist—of individual men and women who want to improve their lot. This will lead to economic progress." I would argue that we can even go beyond this to help create energies for development. We can help instill the idea in individual men and women that their action, especially when combined with that of their neighbors, can bring change for the better.

I want to make it clear that by turning our attention to political development, we should in no way insist upon any particular political system, nor attempt to impose any particular political institutions. The encouragement of involvement, of popular participation, is the key. Nor do I suggest that we

fight the cold war between free and communist societies in the developing world. To be sure, this is still a significant concern as the famous country/city conflict formulation of Lin Piao demonstrates. It has always been a problem for Americans to understand why, despite generous outpourings of money and material goods, the developing nations are not more stable, their people not more committed to the "democratic way of life", and the appeal of communism is still so great.

Part of the problem is inherent in the moderation and pluralism of the democratic approach. Part lies in the relative stages of historical development. C. E. Black has put the contrast well:

"The societies that modernized relatively early were able to adopt a pragmatic approach to their problems and did not bother to think in general terms about what they were doing. When it comes to presenting a succinct statement of their experience and its relevance to other societies, they are at something of a disadvantage as compared with a communist leadership that has gone to great trouble to conceptualize and rationalize its program. In many instances where rapid modernization is taking place with the methods and assistance of the advanced societies, the indigenous political and intellectual leaders are lacking in ideological goals and incentives."

What is the framework in which we will be operating in any effort to contribute to the political maturity of developing nations? Many of our historians and political analysts have listed the characteristics of the modernizing society. They include: consolidation of local authorities, creation of a relatively large and effective bureaucracy, increase in citizen participation in government, increased use of a common language, heightened nationalism, urbanization, levelling of income, education and social differences, growth of mass media, mechanization of agricultural and industrial activities, higher standards of health, disintegration of traditional family and tribal units, increased application of violence, and atomization of the individual from his traditional sources of security.

These characteristics are found in varying degrees and in varying combinations, but to a large extent they reflect the pattern of development of the western societies more nearly than the patterns we have seen so far in the developing world. The nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia have experienced more of the negative than the positive factors of development thus far. The disintegrative factors have outpaced the integrative ones. And the job of achieving broad economic and social progress is proving far more difficult than imagination and expectation are prepared to accept. This makes political development all the more necessary and urgent. As one scholar has said, "it is the past and prospective inadequacy of economic and social progress that argues strongly for more direct action to develop political systems than can enable developing societies to contain and manage the explosive tensions being generated by continuing and inevitable economic and social frustrations."

Without the existence of political leverage through democratic institutions, frustrations will mount; the people will become more susceptible to demagogic appeals; and violent efforts to smash the machinery of society can be the logical result. The government must then be preoccupied with security rather than development and the vicious cycle of constitutional instability and lack of growth continues.

STRATEGY

The key to the strategies we adopt to help achieve political development must be the determination of what kind of nation and society is to be the product. The strategies will vary according to the traditions and needs of the country involved, but I think it is possible to formulate some possible goals

at three levels: at the level of value, at the level of the structure needed to implement those values, and at the level of the performance of the institutions in the structure.

At the value level, political development involves:

1. A sense of community. This includes the integration into the nation-building process of disparate language, tribal, ethnic and geographic groups.

2. Honest, efficient administration. A government riddled with corruption and inefficiency cannot hope to command the support of its citizens.

3. Democracy. By this I do not mean the institutions of federalism and separation of powers as we know them, but rather rights for all individuals, and the correlative obligations of citizenship, including participation in the political process, respect for law, and the tolerance of dissent.

4. The opportunity for civic participation. This involves the freedom for voluntary associations to exist and flourish. De Tocqueville recognized the importance of such associations in our own development when he wrote:

"As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or a feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they look out for mutual assistance; and as soon as they have found one another out, they combine. From that moment they are no longer isolated men, but a power seen from afar, whose actions serve for an example and whose language is listened to."

At another level, it has been argued that certain structural features are necessary. One such listing includes:

1. An effective executive, including a responsible bureaucracy with an imaginative planning capacity.

2. Enforceable limitations on government to guarantee civil liberties.

3. The mechanism for the participation of the adult citizenry in the decision-making process. In practical terms this would involve an elected representative body, especially at the municipal level.

4. The existence of general rules that apply to all citizens, in all regions, at all levels of economic and social achievement.

5. An independent judiciary.

6. Effective decentralization of governmental authority and performance.

7. Political parties and other voluntary groups.

It would be a mistake to insist that each and every one of these institutions be included in our political development model. It is possible to foresee a variety of combinations, suited to the circumstances of the particular nation involved. And we must always resist the temptation to talk about government, politics, or development as a product rather than a process. It is one thing to create a democratic constitutional structure. It is quite another, as our Latin American neighbors have found out, to make it work.

And now we are brought right down to the level of the individual again. In this connection, I would insist very strongly on the existence and support for free voluntary private associations at all levels of government. As we know from our own experience, such organizations are channels for individual expression, teachers of cooperation, and vehicles for economic, social and political change.

The mere existence of such organizations will not ensure liberty, however. They must be democratically run, responsive to the needs of their members, and recognize that opposition to one government may mean responsibility for the next.

This is particularly true of political parties. In many countries, parties have not served as vehicles of change, but as vehicles for personal gain. A responsible political party must recognize its role as an agency of civic education, as a training ground for future

leaders, and as the potential resource of responsible government.

To this end, it has an obligation to provide accurate and honest information to its members and the public at large, to build for consensus not division, and to define the issues fairly so that the voters have a meaningful choice between relevant alternatives.

TECHNIQUES

As a politician, I am realistic enough to admit that it is one thing to state the goals of a politically developed society. It is quite another to achieve them. As members of a society that is sometimes deficient at one or another, or all of these levels of values, structure and performance, what do we have to offer the developing world? What are the techniques of political development?

It is here that we are most sadly lacking in information, not only about what techniques will be successful, but about what is already being done. I have been amazed by the number of programs and organizations that have come to light since public encouragement was provided by the enactment of Title IX. One of the other amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act last year called for greater use of the private sector to achieve development goals. These two commands of the law should be closely coordinated.

Whatever our deficiencies as a nation, I am convinced that we have a great deal to offer, perhaps primarily at the private level. I do not think that it is only traditional Republican policy that persuades me of the crucial role that private enterprise, the free trade union movement, universities, women's groups, and trade associations have played in our own development. There is much that these groups can do to help in Latin America and elsewhere. Many of them are already engaged in exciting programs; we need the organizational capacity to collect the results of their efforts, and share their conclusions with others.

In 1966, we tried to institutionalize this process by requiring AID to: "establish an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this Act, and in the coordination of such programs with the ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernmental United States institutions."

I feel sure that the Congress will inquire carefully into the results that have been achieved thus far when the 1967 bill is before us.

But while I am the first to agree that we need far more research, I would be the last to admit that we cannot act until that research is accomplished. And I think that there are ongoing programs that bear me out.

Some of the most important programs involve the training of leadership. In Latin America there are a number of outstanding statesmen, but lacking are the leaders at the middle and lower levels with the capacity to mobilize public energies and establish the institutions needed to permit effective realization of economic and social goals. Sensitive Americans are engaged in a variety of efforts, using local instructors and specially prepared materials, to help train the community development workers who will go out into the rural areas and attempt to integrate those elements in the national economic and political life.

But, training is only one aspect of the political development process. The structure must be able to provide an outlet for the leader's desire to change and improve the lot of his followers. Expectations inevitably aroused must have a realistic hope of fulfillment. One of the key questions raised in the recent hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Interna-

tional Organizations on the role of communications in the foreign policy process was, motivation for what? As Congressman Fraser pointed out, the motivation of a farmer to grow more may have a destructive impact when his increase ends up in the hands of a corrupt tax collector.

As a consequence political development techniques must operate at a number of levels. On a visit to Chile in 1965 I was much impressed with the efforts of a Dutch agronomist and his wife to instill self-help attitudes through the establishment of an agricultural cooperative for the farming of vegetables. As I pointed out in my report upon my return, "they have had grave difficulties in obtaining a truck to help market the produce—an item that could spell the difference between success and failure of the project, and between hope and despair for the people of the area." I was disturbed that our aid program did not seem to be able to meet this minimal, but important need. Economic significance rather than potential political implication has seemed to govern the attitudes of our AID missions.

Ways must be found to incorporate the political development component into our planning and programming of economic and social development. I have seen, for example, an excellent attempt to do this for Brazil through the development of a grid indicating the program goals in the country, the specific output targets in terms of numbers of teachers, quantity of investment, etc. and the items of self-help input that will work with the necessary aid from external sources to achieve the desired goals. Popular participation is included at every level. This is the kind of thinking that must move beyond the staff level to the highest levels in AID.

One of the most ambitious efforts at political development has been the East Pakistan experience with the creation of local governmental institutions. The traditional highly centralized governmental structure was replaced with an integrated township-country-regional system. Wide latitude for decision making was permitted at local level with provisions for regional networks and systems to avoid duplication and uncoordinated effort. The results, as described in the forthcoming book "The Strategy of Democratic Development" by Edger L. Owens, have been remarkable, both in terms of citizen participation and in terms of economic performance.

As these examples demonstrate the task of political development involves education, the improvement of public administration, and the increase of political leverage for change at all levels. It involves the participation of far more people and resources than is now contemplated by our foreign aid program. It means the resources of U.S. private groups, public programs, and the efforts of our friends in the other developed countries as well. It requires the commitment and resources of the developing countries themselves.

Having set ourselves such an enormous task, what progress are we making? I am both encouraged and discouraged by the degree of attention that is being given to the implementation of Title IX by the Administration.

Vice President Humphrey clearly understands the nature of the challenge. In a speech at the Pan American Union last fall he said:

"Economic and social development can help significantly to provide the basis for civic advancement, but it will not guarantee it. The past and prospective inadequacy of economic and social progress argues strongly for more conscious action to develop political systems that can enable rapidly changing societies to contain and manage explosive tensions within them."

Yet there was no reference to Title IX or to the concepts of political development in the President's Message to the Congress on

foreign aid. Political development may be an idea whose time has come only to Congress. To some extent the time lag is one of personnel. Some of my friends have argued that you have to be a politician to understand and implement Title IX. Others point to the large number of economists, some of whom date back to the Marshall Plan, in policy-making roles in our aid program. Others note once again how little we really know about the developmental process.

All of these obstacles can be understood, but they do not persuade me that a start, however limited, cannot be made now toward the achievement of democratic development goals. We need more research; in particular we need case studies of successful political development efforts. Perhaps most of all we need more people with political skills directing the development effort.

As a layman in the field, I have not attempted to provide definite answers to the riddles of economic, social and political progress. Nor have I been precise in defining my terms. What I have attempted to do in these brief remarks is to draw upon the analysis of some of the most thoughtful individuals I have encountered to stimulate your thinking and your discussion.

Our success has not been so great, nor is our time span so long that we can afford to close our minds to new concepts and new techniques.

PROHIBITION ON MILITARY INSIGNIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to amend section 704 of title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the manufacture, sale, wear, or reproduction of military insignia by unauthorized persons. During the 89th Congress hearings were held on my bill, H.R. 15571, but no further action was taken. The bill I am introducing today is almost identical to H.R. 15571, with only a few technical changes.

I first became aware of the need for such legislation after reading in the Baltimore Sun of a bank holdup executed by a bandit wearing an imitation of a green beret. The green beret, with appropriate insignia, is worn by members of the Army Special Forces, who undergo rigorous training to win it. So proud are these fighting men of their headgear that a visiting general was recently turned down on his request to borrow one. Yet, upon investigation, I discovered that an imitation green beret could be purchased in the local five and dime by anyone with \$1.10.

When I asked the FBI to investigate the selling of the berets with the facsimile of the Army insignia, the special agents assigned to the case were informed by the U.S. District Attorney in Baltimore, Mr. Thomas J. Kenney, that there was some doubt as to whether or not military insignia were covered by either section 701 or 704 of title 18, although existing law clearly prohibits the wearing of military apparel. My bill

amends section 704 to prohibit explicitly manufacturing, selling, wearing, or reproducing military insignia. Furthermore, it clarifies the meaning of insignia, stating that military insignia include medals, decorations, badges, cap devices, ribbons, buttons, rosettes, emblems, patches, flags, seals, coats of arms, shoulder, lapel, and sleeve insignia, and any devices used to indicate grade, rating, branch, service, or duty assignment. Thus, unauthorized use of such military insignia as the Special Forces green beret would be subject to prosecution and punishment under the amended code.

As the result of the FBI inquiry which I initiated, a nationwide retail chain returned all 12,000 unsold green berets to the manufacturer, who has in turn stopped making the imitation berets. However, under the present law neither the retailer nor the manufacturer could have been forced to desist, and there is no way of preventing their quiet resumption of both production and sale.

When I first introduced H.R. 15571, certain organizations whose members wear green berets feared that my bill would prohibit their wearing of traditional headgear. I should like to make it clear that my legislation is intended only to prevent the use of imitation military insignia and thus does not in any way affect organizations such as the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts. In addition, my bill clearly provides for authorization by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department with approval of the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury of special uses of military insignia. The major purpose of my bill is to prevent unauthorized use of military insignia that could degrade the meaning of the symbol or defame the character of those authorized to wear it.

Public reaction to my bill has been enthusiastic. I received a letter from the mother of a son on his way to Vietnam, commending me for taking steps to end the degradation of such an honorable and coveted award. Her son had written:

I talked to the rest of the men in my unit about the Green Berets. They think just about the same way that I do. I feel that the Green Berets are something you work for and can be proud of. I myself don't think they should sell them any place.

The mother felt that the men who wear the green beret are "special men with special training—they have worked and sacrificed for the honor of wearing the green beret, and the badge of courage."

I have received wholehearted support of my bill from several veterans' organizations. The national commander of the AMVETS, Ralph E. Hall, wrote:

We are grateful that you have initiated action to correct over-the-counter sale of military type clothing. The Green Berets, worn by Special Forces, are a badge of honor and should not be sold to or worn by civilians.

Claude L. Callegary, the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, sent a telegram from the National Convention in New York endorsing H.R. 15571.

Mr. Speaker, I shall press for prompt and favorable action on my bill, which

will close the loopholes in the present statute and prevent the degradation, through unauthorized use, of U.S. military insignia.

AMEND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, is there anyone among us who has not come face-to-face, either through personal experience or through the experience of a friend or neighbor, with the pain, the suffering, the tragedy of burns caused by clothing fires? I think the answer would most probably be "No." Every year, more than one-quarter million people suffer burns from clothing fires. More than 2,000 people die from these burns. This is not a rare problem. It is not a peculiar problem. It is a problem that has touched many families across the Nation. Unfortunately, the typical victim is either a very young person or a very old person; people least capable of protecting themselves.

In the city of Detroit, I am advised that during 1966 there were almost 1,700 fires directly involving clothing, bedding, upholstered furniture, and so forth. In addition to the very substantial monetary damage involved in these fires, it is estimated that 50 persons lost their lives. Detroit Fire Department officials tell me that there were about 80 incidents of clothing fires, in which seven children lost their lives. Out of 159 hotel fires in 1966, there were 99 bedding fires in which 35 persons were killed. As to dwelling fires, I am told that there were approximately 1,500 which involved burning furnishings—sofas, overstuffed chairs, bedding, and so forth, and which resulted in seven deaths. These dwelling fires were generally caused by the careless discarding of smoking materials, largely cigarettes.

In places of public assembly, Detroit fire officials tell me that interior furnishings fires are not a great problem, because such establishments are required to submit their furnishings for inspection. Unless these furnishings meet rather stringent flammability standards, they cannot be installed.

It seems apparent to me that, since experience shows that stringent flammability standards successfully reduce fire dangers in such places as restaurants, bars, theaters, and so forth, we should apply similar standards to all clothing and interior furnishings. And that is precisely what my bill would do.

Some of the Members may recall that in 1953 a Flammable Fabrics Act was passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. That act was specifically designed to remove from the market certain well-publicized items of clothing, including the famous "torch sweaters." The act did, in fact, ac-

complish this objective. However, it left untouched many other items which are still on the market, and which continue to pose a threat to the safety of men, women, and children today.

President Johnson, in his message, "To Protect the American Consumer," referred to this continuing problem as "one gap in existing legislation which is so glaring that action should not be delayed."

I agree with this assessment, and, accordingly, I have introduced a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953, to broaden and strengthen the protection afforded by this law.

The bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to: First, revise the existing standards for flammability of wearing apparel to make them more effective; second, issue standards for flammability of interior furnishings, such as draperies, bedding, rugs, upholstery, and foam padding, if it is determined through due process that such standards are needed; third, conduct a study, together with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the causes of human and material losses resulting from furnishings and fabric fires; and fourth, perform laboratory research into the flammability of furnishings, fabrics, and materials.

It is desirable to treat the safety issue caused by this type of fire as a special case. This is because burns present a most difficult medical problem. The amount of care, time, and expense required during the recovery period is much greater than for most other types of injuries.

I commend this bill to the thoughtful deliberation of all Members, and I urge your support for enactment of these progressive and modernizing amendments.

ACCIDENTS IN THE HOME

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the expression "safe at home" becomes a hollow mockery when we come face to face with the hard statistics that several thousand people die each year and more than 20 million are injured because of accidents that occur in and around the home. Perhaps accidents are an element of human nature that we can never hope to eliminate completely. But we can certainly do a lot more than is presently being done to alleviate the threat to life and limb from some of the household products of modern technology.

These products I am referring to are not experimental devices. They are not untried and untested products. They are items found in millions of homes throughout the country. They include furnaces, stoves, incinerators, hot water heaters, sun lamps, power tools, glass doors, lawnmowers, and a host of elec-

trical appliances. These products should not be outlawed. They are useful, necessary, functional, labor-saving, pleasure-giving products which we all want to use and enjoy. But we want to use and enjoy them with the highest degree of assurance of safety that is possible for well-intentioned men to provide.

In President Johnson's state of the Union message, he gave a high priority to steps to safeguard the home against hazardous household products. In the President's message, "To Protect the American Consumer," he recommended the enactment of legislation to establish a National Commission on Product Safety. Because of my strong feeling that we must take effective action based on a foundation of knowledge, I have introduced a bill to establish a National Commission on Product Safety.

The proposed Commission would conduct a factfinding study of the protection consumers now have against injuries caused by hazardous household products, and would report back to the President and the Congress with its recommendations within 18 months. The study would include: First, identification of those products which are determined to present unreasonable hazards; second, the extent to which self-regulation by industry is effective; third, protection given by common law in the States; and fourth, a review of Federal, State, and local laws aimed at dealing with this problem. Those products which have come under recent congressional scrutiny would be excluded from the Commission's study.

Users of household products would have a new sense of security in their enjoyment of these products. Manufacturers would have a single, national pattern to deal with in regard to their liability for possible injuries.

I believe that this proposal is clearly in the public interest, and I urge all Members to give it their most earnest consideration and support.

THE TIME IS NOW FOR CHANGE IN OUR DRAFT LAWS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with other Members of Congress in introducing legislation calling for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on American Manpower and National Security. The purpose of the committee will be to thoroughly explore and evaluate the complex problem of compulsory manpower procurement for our military needs and the effect of this compulsory system on the civilian sector of our economy, and on the traditions of freedom and human liberty that form such an integral part of our American way of life.

We are all aware of the injustices and inequities existing in the present draft

laws and in the system of administering the laws. We discuss and debate these defects each time the draft is due to expire. We acknowledge that a major overhaul of the system is needed, but we take no legislative steps to accomplish this goal. Instead, we vote another automatic extension of the law as it stands.

The time could not be more appropriate for a thorough congressional review of the entire draft structure. We are faced with practically an unlimited supply of draft-age young men as the "baby boom" of 20 years ago comes of age. The increase in draft calls demanded by our tragic involvement in Vietnam has barely tapped this manpower supply. Despite these facts, however, as the draftable manpower pool grows, the percentage of young men in the 19-through-25 age bracket called on to serve steadily diminishes. The unprecedented number of registrants has led to highly selective procedures being followed by the Armed Forces and the Selective Service System. Increasingly we hear the charges that the draft is unfair and discriminatory in many of its aspects.

I am convinced, and I am sure many of my colleagues share this conviction, that public dissatisfaction with the draft is constantly growing. Various reforms have been suggested to modernize the admittedly antiquated draft laws and the system's administrative machinery. Various alternatives to the draft have been proposed—ranging from a lottery system to a military force composed entirely of volunteers. Yet we have undertaken no comprehensive congressional review of the defects inherent in the present system. We have not utilized the congressional committee process to study the relationship of our military manpower procurement policies to our civilian resources and needs. We have failed to investigate the feasibility of initiating another method of procuring men for military service. And, most importantly of all, Congress has given no serious consideration to the basic question of whether we intend to make the draft a permanent institution in our national life, which we have done informally by our automatic renewal of its statutory life.

There are some who will no doubt question the need for a congressional committee study of these problems. I am sure it will be pointed out that numerous commissions and special committees, appointed by and operating under authority of the executive branch, have studied and made recommendations in the area of military manpower needs and procurement. In fact, we are presently waiting for the report on the draft by the latest of these special study groups, the President's National Commission on Selective Service. This particular report was due in January 1967. We can seriously ask if the timing of its presentation will allow us time enough to thoroughly review and digest its contents before we consider legislation to further extend the draft.

I do not believe Congress can sidestep its clearcut responsibility to investigate and offer constructive legislation that

would basically improve, or hopefully abolish, the present system of military conscription. A joint congressional committee, composed of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor would be an ideal forum for conducting the type of investigation that is so urgently needed. The composition of the committee, representing as it would members from committees already concerned with the broad areas of manpower policies, would provide ample assurance that the viewpoint of the Department of Defense is not the only opinion that will be assimilated by the committee. Open, public hearings, where the testimony of experts in military and civilian manpower needs can be subjected to cross-examination and questioning, and their arguments carefully weighed, offer the best method available for a complete and impartial review of the draft laws now in effect. I believe we owe it to the American people to make such an investigation, and I earnestly implore my colleagues to join me in supporting the legislation designed to accomplish this task.

ELECTRICALLY POWERED VEHICLES

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation for a Government-supported program to accelerate the research, development, and demonstration of electrically powered vehicles as a means of seeking alternatives to the internal combustion engine for purposes of reducing the Nation's air pollution problems.

In a recent message to Congress, President Johnson cited the motor vehicle as a major source of air pollution. He said this:

Many sources of air pollution cannot be economically or effectively controlled by our present technology. The sheer number of motor vehicles, may, within a decade or two, defy the best pollution control methods we can develop.

If this proves true surely we cannot continue to use the type of internal combustion engine now in service. New types of internal combustion engines—or indeed new propulsion systems—may be required.

I think it is quite evident that present technology is capable of finding alternative means of propelling vehicles that would help solve a wide range of problems associated with urban congestion, mass transportation, air and noise pollution, and personal travel inconveniences.

It is ironic that although the United States may be first in space, we are bogged down on earth with enormous and frustrating problems that affect the well-being of our people. They grow more complex and more severe and yet we seem unwilling or unable to reassess our

national priorities so that we can begin to develop meaningful solutions.

It has been demonstrated by a recent Gallup poll that millions of Americans would be interested in purchasing an inexpensive electrically powered vehicle, mainly for use as a second car.

Those who were polled were asked if they would buy an electric vehicle—chiefly for use for shopping and other limited purposes—that would have a maximum speed of 40 miles per hour and a range of about 150 miles between battery recharges. As projected, the vehicle would be small and easy to park.

Gallup reported that the results of the poll demonstrated that 36 million adults would be interested in acquiring such a vehicle. On the basis of this finding, it is apparent that an electrically powered passenger vehicle would find a large market.

At present, a limited amount of research relating to the development of batteries and electrical components is being performed by several agencies of the Federal Government. The legislation which I have introduced today would coordinate and centralize this research and set up a new program of total research.

Reports from overseas indicate that other countries are moving more rapidly toward the development of electrically powered vehicles. Electric buses and cars are being tested in Japan; battery operated trucks are being utilized in England; and, a battery-powered train is being developed in Germany.

Senator MAGNUSON, who has provided such imaginative leadership in Congress in this field, has pointed out that the electric battery-powered vehicle affords an opportunity "to make a fresh start with new and more efficient concepts and materials." I agree.

WRIGHT PATMAN SOUNDS THE ALARM AGAINST THE HIGH INTEREST RATE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, no one in Congress has been more alert or more persistent in pointing out the dangers of high interest rates to the American economy than my widely respected colleague, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN.

The distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee last week again sounded the alarm against the high interest rate, tight money policies in a speech before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in San Francisco, Calif. This meeting, the annual gathering of rural electric cooperatives from 46 States, attracted more than 9,000 delegates.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] told these rural electric leaders, the toll of high interest rates is taking huge sums out of the Federal Treasury

at a time when programs such as rural electrification, the war on poverty, education, and urban renewal are hard pressed for the necessary funds. I join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his call for an immediate rollback of interest rates to levels existing before the December 6, 1965, increase imposed by the Federal Reserve Board.

The speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] before the NRECA meeting should be must reading for anyone interested in the Nation's monetary affairs. I commend it to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, TO THE 25TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 21, 1967, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Thank you—fellow fighters against high interest rates—for inviting me to San Francisco.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and its member systems, have always been dependable and effective allies in the battle for sound monetary policy and low interest rates. Through the years, your individual systems, your state associations, and your great national organization have been in the frontlines of the fight. Your resolutions, your words of encouragement, and your active support are deeply appreciated by every member of Congress who is seeking to bring some semblance of sense and responsibility to our monetary system.

Many of you in this room I recognize from past battles for lower and lower interest rates. Certainly none of us identified with the cause for low interest rates could forget the tremendous work of Clyde Ellis. I have known Clyde for many years, both as a colleague in the House of Representatives and as Washington's most able spokesman for Rural America.

Through the years, Capitol Hill—and this includes some of his most ardent enemies—has come to know Clyde Ellis as a tough battler who steadfastly refuses to compromise away any of the hard-won rights of the rural electric systems.

NRECA—under the leadership of Clyde Ellis—has moved to the forefront as a powerful force for all rural America. Today, NRECA is an organization that no one in Washington can afford to ignore.

That is why I am so happy to have allies like NRECA and Clyde Ellis on my side in this fight against high interest rates. I was impressed by the fine turnout at your conference on the "Tight Money Crisis" in Washington last month. This was a worthwhile effort and one which I am sure will continue to pay dividends in our campaign for lower interest rates.

Your battle against high interest rates is not separate from your fight for a strong rural electrification program and for a strong rural America. This battle is tied up with your day to day fight for existence. It cannot be separated.

As you learned during the bitter Eisenhower-Ezra Taft Benson days, high interest rates place a tremendous pressure on your 2% financing. When the Federal Reserve sends interest rates up, the power companies and your other enemies jump in and renew their hue and cry for higher interest rates on REA loans. High interest rates give your opponents a great weapon against you.

And now the highest interest rates in more than forty years are making it difficult, if not impossible, for you to develop a supplemental financing program. As soon as you announced plans to develop an REA bank, the Federal Reserve started jacking up interest rates. Today, high interest rates are placing a tremendous roadblock in the way of your efforts to develop a financing program

that all of your systems can live with. The 37½% increase in interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve on December 6, 1965 was a devastating blow to your systems and to your plans for the future.

So, my friends in the rural electrification program, let me warn you that high interest rates are endangering both 2% money and any type of supplemental financing program. In other words, interest rates must be brought down drastically if the rural electric program is to survive in this country. You are faced with a crisis of gigantic proportions. Nothing means more to the continued success—or more correctly the continued survival—of your program than the campaign to loosen credit and to bring an end to extortionate interest rates.

Let me say to you that this is not Wright Patman's crusade. I am not here to give you my theories and thoughts on monetary policy and the Federal Reserve. But I am here to talk to you as a friend and to tell you that this monetary crisis is a crisis for the rural electric program in every state.

This year, you will be coming to Congress for less than \$400 million in loan funds. As you know, there is much talk on Capitol Hill about budget cuts and about the need to slow down needed economic and social programs. And I do not have to tell you that some of these budget slashers are thinking about the REA program.

It is too bad that some of our Republican friends, who talk so much about budget cuts, have so little to say about high interest rates. This year, \$14.2 billion of your money—the taxpayers' money—will go down the drain for interest charges on the national debt. This is second only to the budget for national defense. This is \$7,000,000,000 more than it would be under reasonable rates. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money were wasted when the Federal Reserve raised interest rates in December, 1965. This is no guess—no figure pulled out of the sky.

Let me quote from the testimony of Charles L. Schultze, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the Ways and Means Committee last month:

"We estimate that the increasing shortage of credit funds and rising interest rates experienced last year are adding approximately \$3 billion to the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967 as a whole . . ."

So, by the admission of the Bureau of the Budget—which I understand is not given to inflammatory statements—the Federal Reserve imposed \$3 billion in extra costs on the Federal Government this year. This is at a time when your systems were struggling to get \$350 million in appropriations from the Congress for loans. You had to fight all the way for this appropriation, while the Congress looked the other way and let the banks and a handful of others walk off with that \$3 billion. And at the same time your opponents were yelling "waste" concerning your supplemental financing proposals.

Yes, your opponents are zeroing in against your efforts to set up some type of financing to supplement the basic REA 2% program. I am in sympathy with your efforts to establish some type of REA bank or other lending agency which would provide these funds. There have been many successful Federal banks, particularly in the area of farm credit, and I see no reason why the rural electric systems should be blocked off from this avenue of financing. However, I want to emphasize that this bank should be designed so that it provides credit, on reasonable terms, and without "strings" which would hamper your program.

The rural electrification program has gained the confidence of the American people through the years. Your record refutes the charges of "waste" which are made by some against Federal credit programs. The rural electrification program has been a productive, self-propelling program that has repaid and

repaid the American people many times over. Rural electrification has enriched the resources of this country.

But, high interest payments are unnecessary and are indeed wasteful. They do not enrich our country.

It takes no mathematical genius to realize that the current level of interest payments by the Federal Government—\$14.2 billion—is putting tremendous pressure on the entire budget, including the allocations for REA. Many opponents of our great economic and social programs—such as REA—are quite happy to see this situation developing. They are happy that interest rates are soaring and that interest charges in the Federal Budget are choking off funds from other parts of the Budget. High interest rates are another means for this group to fight REA, Social Security, the War on Poverty, and other similar programs.

You people from the rural communities of this country know, however, that the bite of high interest rates goes much deeper than just the Federal Budget. High interest rates traditionally have been a means of redistributing the wealth of this country from the poor and middle-income groups to the rich. High interest rates are a tax on the poor and a bonanza for the rich.

High interest rates and the restrictive loan policies of the big banks are the single biggest factor in creating poverty in this country. Today, nearly one-half of the poverty of this nation is in the rural areas and in the small towns. And these are areas that the big banks have traditionally refused to serve. These are the areas that are cut off first when the Federal Reserve tightens money and raises interest rates.

Yes, the big banks of this country stand indicted as the number one enemies of rural development. They have never cooperated with rural people or rural communities in development projects. They have instead sought out the easy, the safe, and the most profitable loans. As many of you in this audience know, farmers have always been treated as second-class citizens at the loan windows. Rural home owners have been forced to meet almost impossible loan requirements in the financing of the most modest houses.

The record of discrimination against rural communities and farmers by the nation's big banks is one of the sad chapters of the financial history of this country. Many once-fine rural communities, now ghost towns, can trace their sad plight directly to the refusal of credit by our banking institutions. In the First Congressional District of Texas, which I have represented since 1929, I have often seen the results of this discriminatory policy.

Your systems came into being because of the failure of the power companies to serve the rural areas. REA was born out of necessity and it continues today out of necessity. It is the same with the Federal credit programs. They came into being and are continued today because the banks said "no" to our rural people and our small businessmen.

The banks today are intensifying this trend. More and more they are discriminating against customers and against whole areas of the country. They are not meeting their assigned purposes in the economy.

The banks are refusing to cooperate with many of these Federal credit programs. In some areas they seem to be doing everything they can to wreck the projects. Recently in the hard-pressed Appalachian region, the Economic Development Administration—the successor to ARA—was willing to lend a new company \$1 million. The agreement for the EDA loan came after a bank had promised to loan the company \$400,000. But the bank pulled out and refused to make its loan, thereby killing the project which would have meant many new jobs for Appalachia.

The Small Business Administration has had similar difficulty in nearly every section

of the country. The refusal of the banks to participate in good loans to good credit risks has stopped the development of small business enterprises. This has meant loss of jobs, loss of payrolls, and the loss of a chance to redevelop many small communities. This has been a sad spectacle and a disheartening situation for many struggling areas.

I am not in favor of nationalization of the banks. However, the banks' refusal to serve all the people and all the areas is creating a situation which may eventually call for drastic reforms. If the banks continue to thumb their noses at the public and serve only their corporate allies, the day may come when the country will demand a change in the system. If banking is ever nationalized in this country, it will be the bankers themselves who brought it about by ignoring the public interest.

Today, the customer has no recourse against discriminatory loan practices of a bank. The bank does not have to tell the customer why he is turned down. He can be turned down for any reason and that's the end of it. The customer has no appeal. And when the customer is turned down at one bank, it is traditional policy for other banks in that area to accept that action and also refuse to make the loan.

Such a policy, of course, has extremely serious implications. It allows the banks to discriminate in favor of one business against another. It allows the banks to aid and abet the concentration of economic power in a few hands in a given area. It allows banks to penalize political enemies—and reward political friends. In short, the banks, through these discriminatory policies, can maintain a life and death power over all activity in a community. And again, there is absolutely no appeal to any type of tribunal. There is no process at the present time to prevent rank discrimination.

This policy is not in the public interest. In fact, it strikes at the heart of our competitive, free-enterprise system. The banks, more than any other institution, have the power to kill off competition, which is the lifeblood of the American economic system.

This situation should be corrected. At a minimum, there should be legislation which would make it possible for a customer to appeal a loan refusal directly to a Federal court. Here, the bank would be required to show cause for its action. It would have to have substantial and reasonable grounds for refusing credit.

This approach should give a public service character to the banking business. The banks, as many of you know, are in a virtual monopoly position in our economy. For instance, they are the only institutions that can legally provide checking account services. They have a monopoly in this area. They enjoy all types of protective and special advantages granted to them by the Federal and state governments. And, of course, the banks have tremendous tax advantages and subsidies.

Under our fractional reserve system, they create money on the Government's credit. Actually, for every dollar in reserves, the banking system is able to create about \$14 for loan or investment purposes. Now, this is a huge advantage for the banks—a tremendous windfall. Yet, in return for these advantages—advantages that no other segment of our economy enjoys—the banks provide virtually nothing in the way of public service. Banks are quasi-utilities, but they take on no responsibility of utility services.

Your systems are required to hook up anybody in your service area. You cannot reject anyone and, of course, you would not think about doing so. But the banks, while enjoying monopoly positions, refuse service to the public and are free to discriminate in favor of the privileged few.

The growing dominance of the banking community over the American economy is

going unnoticed in much of the press. But this is one of the greatest dangers existing to our competitive economic system. Banks are gobbling up small business enterprises at a fantastic rate. They are engaged in the insurance business, credit cards, automobile rentals, accounting, and a variety of other non-banking enterprises. All of this adds to the concentration of power in the hands of a few.

Back in December, our Banking and Currency Committee released a study into "Bank Ownership and Control". This study, as you may have noted in the press, revealed a startling amount of interlocking between banks, insurance companies and mutual savings banks. In many areas, it was discovered that banks were actually holding stock in other banks with which they were supposedly competing. The study indicates that the banking industry in many parts of the country is just one big, happy, interlocked family—with the public locked out.

The study revealed that the trust departments of the banks—which hold more than \$215 billion—are providing the means by which the banks control the stock of other banks and a variety of corporations. In effect, this study destroyed the myth of competition and once again illustrated that the banking community is a prime instrument for concentration of power throughout our economy.

The interlocking relationship of the banks with the rest of the big business community is fantastically far-reaching. The pattern is widespread. For example, power company executives invariably find themselves on the boards of the big banks. Needless to say, such a situation would hardly lead the banking community to take a friendly attitude towards rural electrification.

The growing concentration of power in the hands of the banks and their growing role as the czars of the economy are developments which strike right at the heart of programs like REA and small enterprises everywhere.

This growing power of the banks results directly from the willful neglect by the so-called bank supervisory agencies of the Federal Government. This includes the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. These agencies, instead of protecting the public, have served as vehicles for the promotion of the interests of the banks and, for the most part, the interests of the big banks.

This fact of life is one of the major reasons why we have high interest rates today. In 1965, the big banks, primarily those located in Chicago and New York, demanded an increase in interest rates so that they could hold on to about \$16 billion in time deposits. The Federal Reserve, so used to being a lackey for these banks, gave in almost within hours and granted the 37½% increase in interest rates.

Since that time, we have had skyrocketing interest rates which have created unnecessary and heavy burdens on the consumer, on the Federal Government, and on state and local governments. The Federal Reserve System has either been unwilling, or unable, to stop the trend. It has either been unwilling or unable to say "no" to the big bankers.

The reasons are obvious. The entire Federal Reserve System is set up and operated in a manner designed to give the commercial banking industry the maximum control of basic monetary decisions. Eighty-four of the 108 directors of the twelve Federal Reserve banks either are now, or have been, officers, directors, or stockholders of commercial banks and their opinions and their actions reflect this background.

When the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee meets in Washington in secret, the twelve presidents of the Federal Reserve Banks—all elected by commercial banking interests—are there participating in the monetary decisions. These bankers—the peo-

ple who are going to profit from high interest rates—make the decisions. Under such a system it is not surprising that the public interest is consistently trampled in these secret sessions of the Federal Reserve.

Of course, this setup would be just like having the major power company presidents sitting in on the loan decisions at REA, or participating in the actions of the Federal Power Commission. It is just like having the railroad presidents sitting on the Interstate Commerce Commission, or the television broadcasters sitting on the Federal Communications Commission. The country would not allow this to happen, but it happens all the time in the field of monetary policy.

This banker-oriented domination is heightened by the fact that the Federal Reserve has seized its independence and is unaccountable to the President or the Congress. The Federal Reserve does not come to Congress for appropriations and its books are not audited as are other government agencies. Its Board members serve for 14-year terms and the terms are staggered in such a manner as to prevent a President from appointing a majority until his last year in office. In short, the Board and the entire Federal Reserve System has been shaped through the years to bring it closer to the banking industry and to move it farther and farther away from the public interest.

Actually, what we have in this country is a money dictatorship. The Federal Reserve System doesn't resemble anything else in our democratic government. Nothing else comes close to equalling the absolute, autocratic powers of the Federal Reserve.

When you take a long hard look at the structure, you come to realize that the Federal Reserve System has been shaped along the lines of agencies that are usually found in totalitarian states.

Now, I am not by any stretch of the imagination accusing the Federal Reserve, any of its members, or any banker of being Communist. I want to make that point crystal clear.

However, the parallel between the set-up for the Communist Party in Russia and the Federal Reserve System in the United States is startling.

In the Soviet Union, a tightly-knit clique of the Communist Party runs everything, operating in total secrecy and with total disregard for the wishes of the people and the Russian Constitution.

In the United States, the monetary affairs are run by a tightly-knit clique of bankers, within the Federal Reserve System, operating in total secrecy and with total disregard for the people and for the Constitution of the United States. In both countries, a small group of people have knowledge of, and benefit from, the decisions of these tightly-knit cliques.

In the United States, monetary policy is basically controlled by the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board, the twelve presidents and the 108 directors of the twelve Federal Reserve banks. These 127 people, operating in a secretive manner, have absolute power over monetary decisions.

In the Soviet Union, there are 133 members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This is the group that runs everything in Russia.

Both the Federal Reserve System and the Communist Party in Russia also have a more elite group—a small super-committee.

In the Federal Reserve System, this group is known as the Federal Open Market Committee, and is composed of the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board and five of the twelve presidents of the Federal Reserve Banks—twelve in all—with the other seven presidents participating.

In the Soviet Union, this is a small committee within the Central Committee known as the Politburo. This has eleven members

compared with the Federal Open Market Committee's twelve.

When the Federal Open Market Committee meets every three weeks in Washington, it goes behind locked doors. The shades are drawn, and the Gestapo is put out in the hall to guard against any possible intrusion by outsiders. We never know what goes on in these meetings—until six years later—after the statute of limitations has run on any crime that might have been committed. It is in these sessions that the monetary decisions, interest rates, and the supply of money are decided. Not even the President of the United States can attend these secret sessions, nor can any member of the Congress.

In the Soviet Union, the Politburo meets several times a month in Moscow in totally secret sessions. No one is allowed past the armed guards. Like the Federal Open Market Committee, the decisions of the Politburo are kept secret until the Party decides to release the information.

In both the Soviet Union and in the Federal Reserve System, favors are dispensed to a select few.

The decisions of the Federal Open Market Committee on monetary affairs are made known to a handful of bankers and big business allies—perhaps as many as 2,000 to 3,000 people. They are the only ones who get this favored information and, of course, they are the ones who are in a position to profit from this knowledge.

In the Soviet Union, the Central Committee and the Politburo dispense favors to select members of the Communist Party. They get the advantages, the good housing, the cars, other special privileges and favored treatment.

The Communist Party takes care of its friends in Russia, and in the United States, the Federal Reserve takes care of its banker friends.

In both countries, the people are shut out. The people do not take part in the decisions and they do not benefit from them. Only an elite few get the benefit.

Now in the Soviet Union, we might expect this situation. It is a totalitarian state and it is not surprising that these decisions benefit the few and not the many. But in the United States, it is strange—and I believe tragic—that we have a Federal Reserve System that operates in the same manner as the Communist Party. It is out of step with our other democratic institutions. It is the rotten apple in our barrel of democracy.

Again, I want to say that I am not accusing anyone of being a Communist. But I am saying that both systems operate as dictatorships against the will of the people.

The reform of the Federal Reserve System is the key to lower interest rates. It is the key to a stable economy and to a stable monetary system which would allow programs like REA to go forward. Only under such stable monetary conditions can the rural electrification program expect to develop long-range financing programs to meet the future needs of its members.

It is true that in recent weeks there have been minor changes in the money market and there have been minor downward shifts in a few prime interest rates. But the basic situation has not changed. We are still in a very high interest rate economy. The bankers are convinced that they can hold onto most of the high interest rates which were ratcheted in by the December, 1965 action of the Federal Reserve. They do not plan to give this up unless they are forced to do so by public demand.

If the bankers do succeed in keeping high interest and forcing a tax increase on the people, then we may see a recession in 1967 and possibly in 1968. This country cannot stand high taxes and high interest rates at the same time. Already the economy shows soft spots in many areas, but the Federal Reserve still refuses to budge. In my opin-

ion, we do not need a tax increase. What the economy does need is an immediate roll back of interest rates to the level existing before the December 6, 1965 increase of the Federal Reserve.

This roll back should be accomplished immediately if we are to head off a downward trend in more areas of the economy. This roll back is needed to put the housing industry back on its feet and to prevent a further slide in the automobile industry. And other areas of the economy will soon be demanding this same roll back of high interest rates. For the rural electrification program, let me say again that I do not believe your systems can survive in an atmosphere of high interest rates. If the economy continues with the same high level of interest rates, your systems as well as other small enterprises across the country will be in deep trouble.

I am proud of what the rural electric program has done in my home state of Texas and in the First Congressional District. I want to see this program continue. I want to see this program prosper. And I want to see the rural areas of the nation revitalized. I want to see the rural people move forward with the urban areas.

And this is one of the major reasons why I want to see an immediate roll back of high interest rates.

Thank you.

MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have been introducing and promoting bills since 1961 which would extend protection to consumers from being the unsuspecting purchasers of unwholesome or adulterated meat. The existing law has not been amended or updated for 60 years. Jurisdiction under the existing law is based solely upon whether the slaughterhouse sells its meat to purchasers in another State. Since very few States have adequate inspection laws, this situation has encouraged some large packinghouses to carefully avoid selling to purchasers in another State so that they can slaughter sick or diseased animals which would probably be condemned at a federally inspected plant. They can buy this livestock much cheaper and the customer that buys the meat from it in the retail store has no way of knowing what kind of an animal it came from. While most customers assume that surely such a basic food product as meat would be inspected before it could be sold, the fact is that 20 percent of the meat sold in the United States avoids Federal inspection or an adequate inspection of any kind.

My bills from the beginning have proposed to extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Meat Inspection Act to cover all plants that are large enough to be subject to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley labor law. That law and other Federal laws base Federal jurisdiction upon the size of the plant and its effect upon commerce rather than merely whether it sells to a purchaser in another State.

Other serious problems relating to the

health and welfare of the American people involve contaminated meat or meat from sick animals originally intended for dog and cat food ending up in hamburger. The existing law does not adequately protect against the product sold by rendering works being purchased by someone who is willing to sell it to a processor of sausages or an unsuspecting retailer as if it were proper meat to sell for human consumption.

Another problem involves the importation of meat capable of being used as human food which has not been slaughtered, labeled, branded, or handled in a manner substantially equivalent to that required of domestically slaughtered meat from a Federal inspection plant. The bill introduced today requires equivalent handling of any meat imported.

The administration has now proposed some amendments to the Meat Inspection Act. While its proposal does not extend jurisdiction to cover some of these large plants that sell meat from diseased animals, it does provide a considerable improvement in the protection against adulterated and unwholesome or misbranded meat coming into the market either from importing sources or rendering works. While I think we should still consider the matter of jurisdiction further, I do agree with the other provisions of the new bill offered by the administration and in fact think that it improves on some of the language that was in my former bill and I have introduced that bill.

Even under the bill I have been sponsoring, about 5 percent of the slaughterhouses would not be federally inspected. These are small operators and have a local market where most of the customers know what kind of sanitary standards the operator employs. However, I think consumers should have protection under local health laws as far as the product from these locker plants and slaughterhouses is concerned. My previous bills and the new administration bill both propose a framework for extensive cooperation between the Federal Government and the States to encourage the development of an adequate local meat inspection service. Under the bill, a State which establishes a meat inspection service consistent with the sanitation and other requirements of the Federal law could request from the Federal Government needed advisory assistance, technical and lab assistance, help and training personnel, and matching funds to pay for the administration up to 50 percent.

These bills also provide some additional protection against deceptive labeling under which consumers have at times purchased bologna which they assumed to be meat but which was in fact more than one-third flour and byproducts. In other instances they have purchased ham with up to 30-percent water content. Under these circumstances the prices per pound without an explanatory label very greatly deceived the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the date has long passed when we should provide some additional protection for the consumers of meat. The whole meat industry is playing Russian roulette when it permits this situation to exist, because abuses of a few in the slaughter and sale of cancer-eyed

cows and the sale of adulterated meat for human consumption in products ranging from sausage to frozen dinners could easily cause consumers to react against buying meat products. I have attended livestock sales where some sick-looking animals were purchased by slaughterers and I noticed that the purchasers were always a Federal uninspected plant. I think that having no protection against those animals going into human food is not only bad for the public but is also unfair competition for the processor of wholesome health meat products.

I am glad to see that the administration is taking a very active interest in this field this year and I hope that hearings will be held and a satisfactory bill passed.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress amended the Economic Opportunity Act, and in so doing transferred full responsibility for the economic opportunity loan program to the Small Business Administration. SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin has kept the Congress abreast of the progress of this program since it became his responsibility. It seems appropriate now, after some 3 months of operation under SBA, to report on the program for the Record.

I would like to speak today about one of the least heralded of our many economic opportunity programs, but one which is having a growing impact on the problems of poverty and lack of opportunity in our cities and rural areas alike.

I am referring to the small business loan program authorized under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The economic opportunity loan program got off to a shaky start and frankly many of us wondered whether it would fill the role we foresaw when we enacted the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964.

However, I am pleased to report today that recent changes make it clear that the economic opportunity loan program will fulfill its potential in alleviating the lack of business opportunity which is prevalent in depressed areas and other parts of our great country.

I am also pleased to report that largely as an outgrowth of this program, the Small Business Administration is carrying all of its programs out to small businessmen in the rural areas, the towns and the cities—wherever they work and live.

The Small Business Administration is demonstrating that it is oriented to the needs of the small business community and that this administration is responsive to those needs.

During its first 2 years, the economic opportunity loan program was operated on a limited basis. Long-term loans of up to \$25,000 were available to qualified

low-income businessmen and prospective businessmen who resided in target poverty areas.

Throughout this period the program was limited to fewer than 50 communities served by local small business development centers—SBDC's. All loan applications came to SBA through these centers. No matter how great his need, a small businessman could not obtain an economic opportunity loan unless he lived in a community served by an SBDC.

This created an impossible situation.

Chicago was served well by the program, but the small businessman who lived just over the city line in Cicero, Ill., was ineligible for a loan.

Loans were made in Dallas, but not in San Antonio.

One Indian reservation in North Dakota was eligible, but the other three were not.

Paducah, Ky., was one of the first communities served, but Louisville never did get the program.

The 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act transferred sole authority for the lending program to SBA and in early November, just a few days after the President signed these amendments into law, SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin expanded and broadened the scope of the economic opportunity loan program.

Under the revised program, loans were available in every single community directly through SBA's field offices. Eligibility requirements were broadened so that loans could be made to both low-income persons and to others who lacked the opportunity to compete in business on equal terms.

The results to date have been gratifying. Economic opportunity loans have been made in nearly every State. During the first 3 months of the new program, SBA made an estimated 700 loans for approximately \$7.5 million. These include 280 loans made to low-income small businessmen under the old program and 420 loans made under the revised program guidelines.

About half of the loans made under the revised program went to persons in poverty and the other half were to individuals with higher incomes who nonetheless lacked opportunity.

But the story of the economic opportunity loan program can best be told by the types of loans SBA is making.

In a southwestern city, a determined Mexican-American youth came to SBA for help. His record shop had been burglarized of \$585 and he needed a loan for that amount to stay in business. The banks could not help him.

SBA learned that the youth suffered from cerebral palsy. As a teenager he had quit school to help support his mother but he later completed high school at night. Because of his physical condition he was unable to find full-time work, so he supported himself doing odd jobs. In 1966 he took his life savings of \$1,300, borrowed another \$300 from a finance company and opened a record shop. He lived in the hallway behind the store.

SBA was able to make the youth an economic opportunity loan for \$1,200, re-

payable over 6 years. A volunteer counselor recruited from the business community is assisting, too. The loan and counseling should enable the borrower to upgrade his business.

In Oklahoma, a disabled railroad worker was supporting his family on the meager earnings of a small shoestore and a pension. When the disability pension was discontinued he was no longer able to make ends meet and his creditors threatened to put him out of business. An economic opportunity loan is paying off the creditors and increasing the store's profitability so that it should throw off enough earnings to support the owner's family and repay SBA.

In Paducah, Ky., a Negro taxi owner with a third-grade education received management assistance and a \$15,000 economic opportunity loan. When he came to SBA he operated out of his home in a 1961 taxi without a radio. Today, he has three new taxis with radio communications and an office. The business supports the owner, his family, and three employees and their dependents. During the first 2 months following the loan the business cleared more than \$1,000.

A \$3,000-a-year Paducah truckdriver with a wife and two children received a \$15,000 economic opportunity loan to purchase a truck and become a self-employed contract driver with an interstate moving company. During his first 4 months in his new position he earned as much as he had the entire previous year.

None of these stories would be possible without the economic opportunity loan program, and now that loans are being made nationwide, we will be hearing more and more of these success stories.

But there is another side to this program which is not yet reflected in SBA's loan statistics. It is the Agency's outreach program, and it is the reason why I can say SBA is bringing this program into every community.

At the same time that Mr. Boutin announced the new economic opportunity loan program, he told the staffs of the 73 SBA regional and branch offices to get out from behind their desks and spend more time in the field. Some SBA offices had effective circuit riding programs, but most did not. Mr. Boutin instructed his field staff to develop close working relationships with community action agencies and other organizations representative of the individuals being assisted under the economic opportunity loan program.

The results are impressive.

During the past 3 months, SBA personnel have met with the directors and staffs of hundreds of community action agencies to explain the revised economic opportunity loan program and to recruit local volunteers to support it. SBA loan officers will be interviewing prospective loan applicants in community action centers throughout the country.

In Oklahoma, the SBA regional director met with all 51 community action directors and has embarked on a circuit riding and referral system which will enable him to serve every county on a monthly basis. A loan officer will interview applicants from a cluster of five counties at a community action center

convenient to all five counties. The circuit riding schedule will be adjusted to local demand.

In Texas, under the old system an applicant from Fort Worth came to Dallas to obtain information on the program. Now, SBA has a circuit rider in a Fort Worth neighborhood center weekly, and during the first four visits he interviewed 68 persons. Dallas is also sending circuit riders into Waco, Sulphur Springs, Paris, Brownwood, and Wichita Falls, and other parts of Texas will be covered by other regional offices.

In Connecticut, SBA's regional director spoke with every community action director and in Illinois, the regional director is successfully recruiting leading businessmen in dozens of communities—including board members of community action agencies—to form small business advisory councils. These councils will help identify economic opportunity loan applicants and will provide management assistance to loan recipients.

The New York City regional office for the first time has established regular circuit rider service to Albany, Kingston, Poughkeepsie, Ellenville, Newburgh, and other communities. Previously applicants from these areas came to the SBA office in Manhattan.

The extensive outreach program is essential to the success of the economic opportunity loan program because SBA and other Federal agencies have learned that the only effective way to reach low-income groups is to go into their communities. The middle-class businessman in need of SBA assistance usually will seek out that assistance. But this is not true of the marginal businessman who until recently has had no source of financial aid.

Nonetheless, Mr. Boutin reports that the economic opportunity loan outreach program is resulting in inquiries and applications for all types of SBA loans.

In Dallas, the regional office was averaging about 275 interviews a month for all SBA programs through late 1966. In January 1967 Dallas loan specialists conducted 534 interviews.

In Oklahoma, there were 213 interviews conducted and 23 applications issued for all types of SBA loans in December 1966. The following month there were 582 interviews and 93 applications issued.

SBA has proven that there is a pent-up demand for the economic opportunity loan program in all parts of the country. The same can probably be said for many Federal programs, and the only way to meet this demand is to get out of the Federal offices and carry the programs to the people—the way SBA is doing it.

SBA is providing a perfect example of what President Johnson means when he talks about "creative federalism." I know SBA is reflecting the President's and the Congress' interests and concerns when it develops new techniques to bring its program to the people and make it responsive to their needs.

SALUTE TO A GALLANT MARINE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to be present today at the Marine Barracks for the ceremony at which Capt. Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., of Cheshire, Conn., was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I know of no other occasion that could arouse such a feeling of pride in a fellow American as the one which I have just witnessed. I am reminded of President Truman's remark at a similar presentation in October 1945, when he said:

I would rather have that medal, the Congressional Medal of Honor, than be President of the United States.

President Truman's words accurately state the great esteem in which Americans hold the Congressional Medal of Honor as a symbol of soldierly qualities displayed to a supreme degree by those who have won it. The Nation knows that it is presented only to those men who have displayed the highest degree of bravery and intrepidity. Capt. Harvey Barnum is such a man and is a splendid example of the fine young men who serve in our Armed Forces today.

While on active duty in Vietnam in December 1965, then First Lieutenant Barnum assumed command of a rifle company whose commander had just been killed by enemy fire. While commanding the heavily hit rifle company, Lieutenant Barnum displayed the greatest courage, and disregard for his personal safety, in directing the defense of the company's position, and in leading the eventual successful counterattack against the enemy forces. The bravery, calmness, and leadership displayed by Lieutenant Barnum while under intense enemy fire, provided an exceptional example for the men serving under him; and an inspiration for the citizens of the United States and of the Republic of Vietnam.

As Representative of Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, where Captain Barnum has his home, I am privileged to express the pride which my constituents feel in the achievements of our distinguished fellow citizen and the gratitude which we feel for the sacrifice which he and his fellow fighting men are making to guarantee our security and safeguard the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, following is a biography of Captain Barnum, and the official citation which describes his heroic actions.

CAPT. HARVEY C. BARNUM, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., was born July 21, 1940 in Waterbury, Connecticut. He was President of his Senior Class at Cheshire High School, Cheshire, Connecticut, where he also played football and baseball. In high school, he was a member of the Boy Scouts of America, the "C" Club, and the Gym Leaders Club.

After high school graduation, he entered St. Anselm's College in Manchester, New Hampshire graduating with a B.A. Degree in Economics in June, 1962.

He joined the Marine Corps' Platoon Leaders Class program in November, 1958

and attended two summer training sessions, one in 1959 and the other in 1961. Upon graduation from St. Anselms, he was commissioned a Marine Reserve second lieutenant.

Upon commissioning, he was ordered to Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia where he attended The Basic School until December, 1962 when he began the Artillery Officers Orientation Course, graduating in February, 1963. He was then ordered overseas and joined Battery "A", 1st Battalion, 12th Marines, 3d Marine Division (Rein), FMF, in Okinawa. He served first as a forward observer and then as the Battery's liaison officer. In July, 1964, he accepted appointment in the regular Marine Corps. Prior to completing his Okinawa tour, he also served as the battalion liaison officer. He was promoted to first lieutenant in December, 1964.

Transferred to the 2d Marine Aircraft Wing in April, 1964, Lieutenant Barnum was assigned as the Wing's Career Advisory and Personal Affairs Officer. During Exercise Steel Pike, a landing exercise in Spain, he served as the Wing's Security Officer. Upon returning to the United States from Spain, he was assigned as Officer in Charge, 2d Marine Aircraft Wing Classified Files.

Detached in March, 1965, he began his current assignment as Guard Officer, Marine Barracks, U.S. Naval Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii.

From December, 1965 until February, 1966, Lieutenant Barnum served on temporary duty in Vietnam. As an artillery forward observer with Company "H", 2d Battalion, 9th Marines, 3d Marine Division (Rein), FMF, Lieutenant Barnum's actions on December 18, 1965 earned him the Nation's highest award for valor, the Medal of Honor. He was promoted to Captain in June, 1966, after his return to Hawaii.

Captain Barnum's medals and decorations include the Medal of Honor, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Vietnam Service Medal.

His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Harvey C. Barnum of 5 Glenbrook Drive, Cheshire, Connecticut. He has one brother, Henry C. Barnum of 250 Steuben Street, Painted Post, New York.

CITATION

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to First Lieutenant Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Forward Observer for Artillery, while attached to Company H, Second Battalion, Ninth Marines, Third Marine Division (Reinforced), in action against communist forces at Ky Phu in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 18 December 1965. When the company was suddenly pinned down by a hail of extremely accurate enemy fire and was quickly separated from the remainder of the battalion by over five hundred meters of open and fire-swept ground, and casualties mounted rapidly, Lieutenant Barnum quickly made a hazardous reconnaissance of the area seeking targets for his artillery. Finding the rifle company commander mortally wounded and the radio operator killed, he, with complete disregard for his own safety, gave aid to the dying commander, then removed the radio from the dead operator and strapped it to himself. He immediately assumed command of the rifle company, and moving at once into the midst of the heavy fire, rallying and giving encouragement to all units, reorganized them to replace the loss of key personnel and led their attack on enemy positions from which deadly fire continued to come. His sound and swift decisions and his

obvious calm served to stabilize the badly decimated units and his gallant example as he stood exposed repeatedly to point out targets served as an inspiration to all. Provided with two armed helicopters, he moved fearlessly through enemy fire to control the air attack against the firmly entrenched enemy while skillfully directing one platoon in a successful counterattack on the key enemy positions. Having thus cleared a small area, he requested and directed the landing of two transport helicopters for the evacuation of the dead and wounded. He then assisted in the mopping up and final seizure of the battalion's objective. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct reflected great credit upon himself and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service."

American fighting men traditionally have performed with bravery and determination under the most trying circumstances. I am honored that that medal which is awarded by the United States for the highest degree of gallantry is known as the Congressional Medal of Honor, and that I have the privilege of representing one of those extraordinary men to whom the award has been presented. I know that the Members of this House join me in saluting Captain Barnum for his outstanding fearlessness and bravery.

His actions reflect the greatest credit upon himself, his family, the U.S. Marine Corps, and the United States. With men of Captain Barnum's stature serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, this Nation will achieve its goal of world security under justice.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has hailed the President's recent message on children and youth as "the most closely fitted to the immediate capability of the Government."

In a thought-provoking editorial, the Post points out the value of the President's message and of its call to insure that not only the average American child, but "even the least fortunate of children will be included in the general advance" that our Nation is making in the areas of education and health. The editorial goes on to support the President's proposals which will bridge the disparity between the top two-thirds and the bottom third of this Nation and prevent a fatal fragmentation in the next generation.

The editors of the New York Times echo the Post's enthusiastic acceptance of the President's message. They call Mr. Johnson's message "wide ranging" and go on to say:

Virtually nothing seems to have been left out in offering new answers to the challenges of an ever-younger population, or in building on the more successful of already established programs.

I feel that my colleagues will find both articles informative and enlightening and I include them in the Record:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1967]

AND FOR YOUTH

Almost every problem concerning children and youth is touched on in large or small degree in the President's wide-ranging special message to Congress yesterday.

Virtually nothing seems to have been left out in offering new answers to the challenges of an ever-younger population, or in building on the more successful of already established programs.

There is a hint of urgency in the plans for the coming summer. Dramatically, the President is establishing a "Cabinet-level" council, headed by the Vice President, to promote summer youth opportunities. These would include asking families to share their summers with less advantaged children, a search for volunteers to teach and guide, and camping facilities to be built for another hundred thousand youngsters by next year. But it is in year-round programs that the greatest strides are suggested. Many of the plans are based on successful experimentation in such urban centers as New York and some on the outstanding programs operated in New Haven by Mitchell Sviridoff before he became Human Resources Administrator here.

Head Start, the most universally accepted of Mr. Johnson's sociological projects, is to be extended from a summer program to the full twelve months and also down to three-year-olds, with day care for even younger children.

Perhaps the biggest change in conventional welfare patterns will result from the President's proposal for neighborhood child and parent centers. Obviously, anything as costly as this must be paid for by public funds, which probably means that present private agencies in many instances will turn to demonstration projects and more flexible phases of guidance and assistance.

As a preface to announcement of new juvenile delinquency legislation, the President speaks of present Federal educational and financial incentives and job training opportunities. Some of these, notably the Job Corps, have been less than successful. A major challenge to all these programs is the problem of actually getting young people into the job stream.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1967]

THE CHILDREN'S CHARTER

The strongest force for social reform in American history is the country's concern for its children. The bitter debate over relief and public responsibility for private distress is muted when it comes to children. We are an optimistic people, and one mark of it is the increasingly strong and comprehensive system of laws that we are building to guarantee our aspirations for these children.

President Johnson returns to this purpose in his Message on America's Children and Youth. As a practical matter, all of Mr. Johnson's legislation, the bill that will bring the greatest benefits to the largest numbers of children is the Education Act of 1965. In the present Message he is chiefly talking about the children whose birth and circumstances disqualify them from drawing much good from the public schools. He is talking about the children to whom the usual medical services are not available. He is talking about the children who have got themselves into trouble with the police. Some Americans will always be much better off than others. But there is an imperative Federal interest in seeing to it that the disparity between the top two-thirds and the bottom third never becomes so wide that the Nation splits, in Disraeli's phrase, into two nations. The President's proposals are in-

tended to insure against that fatal fragmentation in the next generation.

The Head Start preschools will not get much bigger, but they will reach down for still younger children. This shift of emphasis is precisely the way that the experimental programs of the war on poverty ought to operate. Under the influence of Head Start, and with the help of other Federal funds, school systems all over the country are now establishing and improving kindergartens. As the local schools begin to provide systematically for the 5-year-olds, the resources of Head Start are freed to begin working more widely with children of 3 and perhaps even younger. If, as some scientists believe, a child's verbal aptitudes are largely formed by his third birthday, it may be necessary to reach some children much earlier, perhaps in their own homes, to break the pattern of hereditary illiteracy.

The President spoke last month, in the State of the Union Message, of the difficulties arising from the shortage of skilled personnel in the new health and welfare programs. Now he points out that the United States has an excessively high infant mortality rate, and he proposes new centers for child health in the slums. But there are only 12,000 pediatricians, and 13,000 obstetricians, in the country. "New types of health workers must be trained to help our doctors do more," the President concludes. The emerging Federal emphasis on semiprofessional skills, in clinics, schools and welfare agencies, is essential to the expansion of benefits that the President envisions.

In the current spate of ambitious presidential messages, it is fair to ask whether Mr. Johnson is not raising expectations too high. But of all his recent messages on domestic policy, this Message on Children is the most closely fitted to the immediate capability of the Government. The advances proposed here lie entirely within the established tradition; they are not radical departures, but rather the continuation and perfection of work begun long since. The reforms in public relief, for example, would only extend to the remaining States a set of rules already adopted by many of them. The noxious man-in-the-house rule, forcing indigent fathers to desert their families, would at last be prohibited; a majority of the Senate has voted to retain that rule in the city of Washington, but they will not vote to uphold it in their own States.

Federal and local governments are working effectively to improve the education and health of the average American child. In this Message, the President seeks to ensure that even the least fortunate of children will be included in the general advance.

H.R. 6118—TO EXTEND FOR 2 YEARS CERTAIN EDUCATION ACTS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 6118, a bill to extend for 2 additional years the provisions of certain education acts which would otherwise expire.

This bill does not make any substantive changes in existing legislation, nor does it expand any existing authorities. It only extends through fiscal year 1969 several authorizations which are now

scheduled to run out on June 30 of this year. The legislation affected is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, and the so-called federally impacted areas programs.

The provisions of these programs which would be extended are as follows:

First. Additional aid to impacted areas for the construction and continued operation of schools damaged by natural disasters. This provision was originally added to the impacted areas programs by Public Law 89-313, enacted in 1965. I am pleased to note that I had the honor of introducing and managing that legislation during my freshman term in this body.

Second. Assistance to public institutions of higher education for the restoration and equipping of facilities damaged by natural disasters.

Third. Construction assistance to impacted areas on behalf of "B category" children; namely, those whose parents either live on or work on Federal property, but not both.

Fourth. Payments under titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on behalf of Indian children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior. Title I provides general assistance for the education of educationally deprived children; title II provides assistance for library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials; and title III provides assistance for supplementary educational centers and services.

Fifth. Payments under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on behalf of children in overseas schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing controversial in this bill. These provisions have all been thoroughly studied and reviewed by this body. Public Law 89-769, which authorized disaster assistance to institutions of higher education, was passed by voice vote. Public Law 89-313, which authorized disaster assistance to impacted areas, and Public Law 89-750, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, which authorized the remaining provisions to be extended by H.R. 6118, were both passed by overwhelming majorities.

The programs extended by H.R. 6118, effectively meet serious, and long-neglected needs in several sectors of American public education. These programs deserve our continued support. Mr. Speaker, I urge the early consideration and passage of this legislation.

SPEECH OF ROBERT JEROME, WINNER OF VFW'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert at this point in the

RECORD the speech by Robert Jerome, of Turlock, Calif., which won for him the California competition in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest this year.

Turlock is one of the principal cities in my congressional district and I know how proud the residents of his community and our entire State are of Robert.

Robert will be in Washington next week to participate in the national competition and I wish him every success in the presentation of his speech, which is an excellent one. It follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Robert Jerome)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the eve of World War II made a fervent request to the American people during one of his famed fireside chats. "We must be the arsenal of democracy!" he pleaded. He felt that during a time of world turmoil, America had to remain the light in the darkness, the stronghold of freedom.

America remained the arsenal of democracy throughout World War II as a beacon light of hope to millions throughout the world. American democracy survived the Second World War as it had the first and countless wars before that. But, now, a new and different force works for the destruction of our arsenal of democracy. This enemy carries no weapons, no bombs, nor does he sinisterly creep through the underworld plotting the overthrow of the government. This person may look harmless enough, but in reality he is more detrimental to society than the largest atomic bomb. This adversary who poses the severest threat to American democracy is, surprisingly enough, Mr. John Smith, the average American. Despite his meek exterior, Mr. Smith is a keg of dynamite with a slow-burning fuse placed under our arsenal of democracy. For you see, Mr. Smith no longer cares about his country. He is too caught up in himself and protecting American democracy just isn't in his schedule.

"Mr. Smith, what does democracy mean to you?"

"Well, that's a hard question. As a democratic American, I'd say democracy means that I can take advantage of all the freedoms guaranteed to me by the Constitution."

Yes, Mr. Smith, you certainly are, as you say, a democratic American. You most assuredly do take advantage of freedom. In fact, you take and take and take, but the only thing is, you never give. To me, democracy means more than merely grabbing all the freedom you can lay your hands on. It means protecting the destiny of America so that freedom will be left for the future. Democracy means more than merely reaping the autumn harvest of liberty, it means nurturing the crop through blight, disease, drought. It means not merely caring for yourself, but for your country. As the old saying goes, "You can't get something for nothing." There is a price that accompanies freedom and that price is the daily battle of guarding American democracy.

"Mr. Smith, would you say there is anything wrong with America today?"

"Well, I guess I'd say the crime problem is getting a little out of hand."

"Are you doing anything about the situation, Mr. Smith?"

"Me! These crimes don't affect me! I'm an honest citizen!"

Yes, Mr. Smith, you are indeed an honest citizen, a democratic American as you call yourself. Crime is running wild, and you know it. Yet you will do nothing to remedy the situation. You will sit back in your own self-centered little world and go right on, as you say, taking advantage of all those free-

doms guaranteed you by the Constitution, while your country may be crumbling beneath your feet. And, Mr. Smith, you call yourself a democratic American.

"Mr. Smith, how do you feel about the civil rights problem?"

"Oh, I really feel the Negroes should be given equal rights."

"How would you feel if a Negro family moved nextdoor to you?"

"What! And downgrade the value of my property!"

Mr. Smith, you are certainly a democratic American. On the outside, you are all brotherhood and love, but deep in your heart lies the cold, hard belief that you are better; that the white man was born to rule supreme above the black. Mr. Smith, you will be right up there at the head of the receiving line when freedom is being ladled out, but you'll also be elbowing out all those you consider "inferior" to yourself. And, Mr. Smith, you call yourself a democratic American.

Mr. Smith, democracy is not one-sided. It is a give and take situation. You must give to your country before you can take its freedoms. You must protect your country before it can protect you. You must pump the well of democracy before you can drink the water of freedom.

As Roosevelt said, "We must be the arsenal of democracy!" He was right. We must be the country that all others can look to for hope. But our arsenal cannot be strong until Americans know the true meaning of democracy. We must give to our country before we can take from its arsenal. Mr. Smith will have to stop calling himself a democratic American and become one.

THE HAWAII LEGAL AID SOCIETY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Hawaii Legal Aid Society, Mr. Dwight M. Rush, has forwarded to me a report on the first 6 months of the society's operation, and I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point as a very definite indicator of the need in my State for this service. Mr. Rush quite rightly points out that statistical tabulations for such a short period can only be tentative, but I am in total agreement with his conviction that the caseload handled during these months clearly illustrates the value of this program and the necessity for our continuing support:

Six months have passed since the OEO Legal Aid Project was funded in June of 1966. As most of you know, at that time we employed a staff of two attorneys and two secretaries. With OEO funding, we have expanded our staff to five staff attorneys and a chief counsel, aided by three attorneys hired as investigator-law clerks. During the month of June 15th to July 15th, the new staff underwent an extensive training program. In August, eleven neighborhood centers were opened on the island of Oahu, at Waiānae, Nanakuli, Pearl City, Halawa, Kalihi, Palama, Papakōlea, Palolo and Waimanalo. These neighborhood offices are served half a day twice per week or half a day once per week, or on an appointment basis, depending upon the case load.

Statistics over the early months of our operation are expressed below. These statis-

tics relate for the most part to August through November. Our outside island offices did not open in Kona and Hilo until September, 1966 and we did not open offices on Molokai and Kauai until November of 1966. The Wailuku office is not yet in operation because there has been some difficulty in arranging office space on the island of Maui. Two of the attorneys on our staff were not hired until October and one attorney was hired in September.

The statistics below are expressed in cases. Under these statistics a client who comes to the office for an interview is a case. Likewise, one who comes to the office and for whom a case is tried for a period of three weeks with extended appeals to the Supreme Court is also a case. The concept does not lend itself to accurate calculations but these are the only statistics that we presently have.

We have experienced a rise in demand through the neighborhood offices. In the months of August, September, October and November, we received 191 cases from the first nine of Oahu's neighborhood centers. This averages at approximately 21 cases per neighborhood center, or approximately 5 cases per month from each neighborhood office. In September, we opened an office at Hauula and through November have picked up five cases. The Kahaluu office began operations in November and received eight clients during that month.

We opened a neighborhood center in Kona, on the island of Hawaii, and have received a total of 33 cases during the months of September, October and November. In Hilo we have received 42 cases during the same months. Our neighborhood center at Kanakakā, Molokai, opened in November and the Society found 13 cases waiting. Although we had no neighborhood center on Lihue, Kauai, until November, we received 6 cases there during the month of November and 6 cases in December.

In May of 1966, prior to the OEO program, we received 141 new cases. Since the beginning of the OEO expanded program, the number of new cases per month received has risen from 168% to 186% above the May level to a figure of 392 new cases in October and 379 in November. Cases completed during this period total 1,803. Cases completed per month stood at 370 in August, 356 in October, but fell to 295 in November, an increase in monthly cases completed over May 1966 of from 109% to 162%.

Meanwhile, our backlog in cases has increased from a level of 359 cases in May, 1966 to a level of 722 in November, 1966, an increase of 100%.

The bulk of cases handled by the Society fall into the field of family law including non-support cases, adoptions, guardianships and divorces.

These figures do not include the many calls for aid that we received from other community action programs. At the request of the OEO the staff attorneys and Chief Counsel have rendered substantial aid and service in the administration of an educational program, including TV appearances, lectures, formal and informal group discussions, and drafting informational leaflets. This educational program has been directed toward preventive law. In addition, the staff has incorporated at least ten community action projects to implement OEO programs.

It is always dangerous to generalize from statistics arising out of as short a period of operation as the few months period that the Society has operated under the expanded program. Nevertheless, I believe that we can conclude from the above figures that there is a definite need for the services which the Society is rendering and that the demand will become much greater as the availability of our services becomes better known.

The individual who is entitled to the

greatest credit for the smooth transition from our former practice into the OEO Legal Aid project is our Chief Counsel, Ronald Y. C. Yee.

Dated: Honolulu, Hawaii, January 16, 1967.

DWIGHT M. RUSH,
President.

ACCELERATED ACTIVITIES OF SO- VIET POWER IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in two statements to the House in the last session of the Congress—"Caribbean Triangle; Panama Canal, Guantanamo, and Puerto Rico—Objectives of Subversive Attack," on September 20, 1966; and "Panama Canal: U.S. Sovereignty or Communist Control?" on September 29—I commented at length on the Communist revolutionary program for conquest of the Caribbean and quoted the resolutions adopted in January 1966 at Havana by the Tricontinental Conference of African, Asian, and Latin American Peoples. What was stated on those occasions applies with even greater force today, for Cuba is still serving as a beachhead for spreading revolutionary violence and terror in the most strategic area of the Western Hemisphere.

Among the activist organizations that grew out of the 1966 Havana Conference is the Latin American Continental Students Organization—OCLAE—which has formed student groups in seven Latin American countries, including the Student Federation in Panama. Its purpose is to serve as the vanguard of revolution and to place revolutionary governments in power with student uprisings.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the executive branch of our Government is engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the Republic of Panama as regards the future status of the Panama Canal and has publicly stated its aim to surrender our treaty-based sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama. This country, if the truth must be told, is a land of endless revolution and inherent political instability and infiltrated with Red revolutionaries from Cuba.

In a series of addresses in the Congress over a period of years, I have discussed at length why such action by our Government should not be permitted. Some of my more important addresses and statements on various angles of the canal problem have been published in one volume as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions," and distributed to all Members of the Congress, our principal educational institutions, and libraries.

As to the gravity of the proposed surrender, I can think of no action by our Government that is fraught with graver peril. It was, therefore, with keen inter-

est that I read in a recent issue of *National Review* a most illuminating article by Paul D. Bethel, executive secretary of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, an organization of distinguished leadership. In this article, its author gives much new information on the dangers to the south of us in the form of expanded Vietnam type of guerrilla jungle wars, how Cuba has become an overt military threat, and why the time has come to transfer the problem of hemispheric security from the Department of State to the Pentagon. If the Vietcong in South Vietnam can tie up the United States in southeast Asia for more than 5 years, what is to prevent the same situation occurring in the jungles of Latin America under Soviet leadership?

Back in 1965 when the President of the United States announced the status of the treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, I issued a press release predicting accelerated activity among Communist revolutionary elements all over Latin America and stressing that there should be only one flag over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal—the flag of the United States. The response to that release from all parts of the country and abroad was one of universal acclaim, especially from informed persons who have lived or served on the isthmus and know its problems from direct observation and experience, including members of our Armed Forces on the isthmus.

As has been stated by me on numerous occasions in regard to the Caribbean, the Panama Canal has been, and still is, a prime objective of the world revolutionary movement in its drive for domination over vast strategic areas and key water routes. Proposals to share control of this artery of interoceanic transport with any other country or organization are not solutions for the realistic problems involved but abdication of our responsibilities and violations of our own commitments to Great Britain and Colombia, recognized long ago by the maritime nations of the free world. Moreover, the Canal Zone is American soil, forming a part of the coastline of the United States.

Despite all the amazing developments of communistic revolutionary power and purpose in the Latin American nations, the State Department, as far as I am able to learn, never issues a press release or other type of information relative to such dangerous movements in these neighbor countries. The Soviets are constantly receiving more generous favors and concessions from our Nation yet, with effective malignancy, arms the Vietcong and prolongs the slaughter of American soldiers, Vietnam civilians and soldiers, with resultant monumental expenditures by our taxpayers and a war exceeding the length of either World War I or II; and also, despite the fact that the Soviets, by ceasing to supply the Vietcong, could bring the war to an immediate close with a peace agreement guaranteeing the freedom of South Vietnam.

All this illustrates the naive dominance in the conduct of our foreign affairs, which is unparalleled in the entire history of our country.

The indicated article and press release

which follow are commended for reading by all Members of the Congress and by responsible officials in the executive agencies, particularly those dealing with Canal and Latin American problems:

[From *National Review*, Feb. 7, 1967]

CAN CASTRO START A NEW VIETNAM?

(He's trying to. And he may pull it off if the State Department doesn't wake up to what's going on. The time to stop it, says Mr. Bethel, is now.)

(By Paul D. Bethel)

Bureaucracy often has about it a frozen character that renders it unresponsive to change and incapable of meeting new challenges. Nowhere is this more evident than in the State Department's attitude toward Cuba and the rest of Latin America. When a Washington reporter asks about U.S. policy in this area, he is given a speech delivered back in April 1964 by then Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, a speech dusted off and issued in pamphlet form. Ball's discourse, done up in a bright red, 22-page package, *U.S. Policy Toward Cuba*, does not of course deal with developments in Cuba and the balance of Latin America over the past two-and-one-half years, nor has any attempt been made to update it. Yet, it stands as the definitive word on U.S. policy.

The existence of a Soviet base in Cuba is not, in the judgment of the State Department, a military threat to the United States. More surprising still, the State Department insists that Cuba is not a direct military threat to the other countries of Latin America. As the Ball pamphlet states: "Cuba does not possess air- and sealfight sufficient to permit it to take offensive action against its neighbors." In almost ho-hum fashion, the paper adds: "In any event, we maintain overwhelming military forces in the area to prevent Cuba from attacking other American Republics."

Other passages in the pamphlet reveal the philosophy behind U.S. policy toward Cuba and Latin America. Admitting that Cuba does present a problem of subversion, the pamphlet reads: "Vulnerability is greatest where social injustice is widely prevalent, where anachronistic societies remain dominated by small elites—tight little oligarchies that control the bulk of the productive wealth." The enemy, to the State Department, it would seem, is not a predatory Cuba, but Latin American governments which fail to provide for their own people.

The social worker mentality now directing our policies in Latin America is further revealed by other passages in the State Department document: "In the long run, Latin America will be rendered immune to Communist infection only by an amelioration of conditions—political, economic, and social, in which subversion flourishes . . . until such a transformation is accomplished, Latin America will remain a fertile seedbed for Communist subversion."

The shocking truth is that U.S. policy is based on a proposition that is not believed by sophisticated Marxists anywhere in the world—namely that poor economic conditions are a precondition to Communist advances. One would have thought that this idea had been laid to rest when, on July 26th, 1966, no less an authority than Fidel Castro, in recalling Cuba's excellent economic conditions at the time he came to power, said: "Well, if this concept [poor economic conditions] had been applied to this nation, a revolution never would have taken place. Never!"

TRICONTINENTAL SUBVERSION

However that may be, there is not much question that Russian-Cuban subversion is proceeding to a jet-propelled pace. The Tricontinental Conference, held in Havana last January under Russian sponsorship, brought together some 600 Communist delegates and

observers from 82 countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. When the delegates decamped after two solid weeks of propaganda and planning, they left in their wake an efficient organization to expand Vietnam-type wars into a global war of subversion.

Of the several organizations to come out of the Tricontinental Conference, the most vigorous is the Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO). This is not surprising, since Fidel Castro and his Russian masters have been at the business of subverting Latin America for years. Thus, when the Communist delegates convened in Havana last January, Cuba was able to show them a well-developed apparatus of subversion, backed by 43 guerrilla training camps, already active and successful. That apparatus has since been refined and fashioned into a deadly instrument by which terrorism and subversion have advanced in this hemisphere at a terrifying rate.

One of the latest additions to LASO is the Latin American Continental Students Organization (OCLAE). To date the Cubans have been able to corral student groups in seven Latin American countries—the Federation of University Centers in Venezuela, the Dominican Students Federation, the General Association of Students of Guadalupe, the Panamanian Students Federation, the Pro-Independence Student Federation of Puerto Rico, the University Students Federation of Uruguay, and the National University Federation of Colombia. All receive money, arms, and direction through LASO in Havana. Cuba also trains student militants at its Revolutionary Education School in San Francisco de Paula, near Havana.

The role of the OCLAE was outlined in Havana last July. There, Cuban Minister of Education José Llanusa told his Communist charges that Latin American students would be in the vanguard of the revolution, adding that they would "smash the showrooms of Latin America and put revolutionary governments in power." Success in Latin America most assuredly will be followed by similar student uprisings in Asia and Africa, and even in the United States.

Today LASO, and its student arm, OCLAE, is so effective as to constitute the most potent weapon in the Communist arsenal. It has rocked governments from Buenos Aires to Bogotá through blackmail, agitation and assault. The Dominican Students Federation demonstrated its power by forcing the expulsion of 150 professors, taking control of the faculty, and turning the University of Santo Domingo into an armed Communist camp. Relatively quiet since Joaquin Balaguer swamped Juan Bosch in the elections for President last June 1, the Dominican Republic is again threatened by civil war. President Balaguer said on December 6 that Communist propaganda is pouring into the country, "some from Russia and other countries behind the Iron Curtain." He added that "Communists and extreme leftists have been visiting the 'constitutionalists' [those who headed the revolt in April 1965], asking them to take over their old posts in the city" for a renewal of urban violence to force Balaguer out of office. The tense situation is further exacerbated by broadcasts from Havana urging the Communists and "constitutionalists" again to join forces and "defeat the servants of imperialism."

In Colombia, urban terrorism and guerrilla assaults in the rural areas have forced President Carlos Lleras Restrepo to make three impassioned addresses to the nation since taking office in August. Pointing out that terrorism is "planned precisely to cause trouble and maintain an atmosphere of uneasiness throughout the country," President Lleras revealed that "the stepping up of guerrilla warfare is called for openly through the microphones of Castroite radio stations." Referring to Cuba and indirectly addressing himself to Washington, he said: "It is a fact

that a foreign country is intervening in Colombia's internal affairs, touching off guerrilla wars." He added: "Agitators are promoting student strikes—professional agitators—turning those strikes into pretexts and tools of violence . . . they attempt to pass off kidnappings, the stoning of shops, the burning of cars, as mere innocent acts of students which they claim cannot be classified as crimes." They are crimes, in the opinion of the President of Colombia, and he sketched their dimensions: "During the first two days of the Antioquia University strike, the damage amounted to 500,000 pesos."

Last October, President Lleras and John D. Rockefeller were set upon by trained student agitators as they entered the University of Bogotá to inaugurate the Veterinary Science Laboratory. (Much of the funds which made the construction of the laboratory possible came from the Rockefeller Foundation.) Other acts of violence involving student militants caused Colombia's President to cry out to the nation: "Are we to permit rebellion to be openly advocated; are we to permit troops to be killed in ambush?" He spoke of Communist assaults against interior towns and villages in these terms: "I visited a military hospital where fourteen dead and wounded peasants, serving their compulsory military service, were taken, following ambush. They were even younger than university students who, by reason of attending the university, are exempt from military service."

President Lleras reminded his listeners that the Communist terrorists can destroy faster than a free society can build. He said: "The country wants order, work, and progress, the constructive implementation of the national transformation programs . . . we need foreign investments . . . but it is precisely because of this that extremists, directed from abroad, are bent on destruction." Cuban-exported terrorism has caused a precipitate flight of capital from Colombia, forcing the government to apply restrictions against the transfer of money out of the country.

In the very midst of President Lleras's denunciations of Cuban subversion, U.S. Ambassador to Colombia Reynold E. Carlson permitted himself a political observation which is quite in keeping with stated U.S. policy regarding Cuba. An interview published in the newspaper *El Espectador* quoted him as saying that present relations between Cuba and the United States "are now based on the interchange of weather reports on hurricanes." He added, however, that "those relations can improve. It is a matter of patience." The newspaper *El Siglo* quoted Ambassador Carlson on Cuba as follows: "To consider Cuba as 'a danger to democracy' is now 'slightly archaic.' The position of the two countries is now changing little by little."

Guatemala has raised warning flags over that guerrilla-infested country. When liberal Cesar Mendez Montenegro was installed as President last July, he immediately declared an amnesty for Guatemalan guerrillas. By November, however, he was forced to declare martial law for a thirty-day period and obliged to extend it another thirty days when the guerrillas struck at mountain villages and in Guatemala City in mounting waves of terrorism. The climate of "unrest and uneasiness" which the Colombian President says the guerrillas are trying to create in his country has already been achieved in Guatemala, according to Guatemala's Vice President. Vice President Clemente Marroquin wrote in his newspaper, *Le Hora*, on November 2: "It looks as though Guatemala will be the next American nation to fall to Marxism. At the rate things are going," he continued, "everything points to this eventuality. . . . Day after day the Communists advance on two fronts: victorious armed attacks by the guerrillas, and greatly in-

creased harangues by agitators. But over and above these two alarming facts there is even a more serious situation, and that is the panic which is taking hold of the people."

Vice President Marroquin wrote his article of warning as 21 clashes erupted between the police and army units and guerrilla bands. Student militants were involved in all but three. In the innocent guise of students, Communist youths have been particularly successful in gaining entrance to government offices and public buildings. A four-man group seized control of the *Nuevo Mundo* radio station in Guatemala City long enough to broadcast messages on behalf of the Castroite Armed Rebel Force (FAR), headed by guerrilla chieftain Cesar Montes. Marroquin wrote of such activities: "The guerrillas can act night or day without the slightest fear of persecution. . . . The fall of Guatemala could take place in a few hours or even minutes. Once the capital is in a state of panic, everything will inevitably deteriorate into a government composed of 'students, peasants, and laborers.' . . . We have the guerrillas under the same roof, in our own house, at the same table, and it is only necessary for them to say, Now! and chaos will ensue."

Another Central American country, Costa Rica, is clearly alarmed at the increasing threat to Latin America posed by a Russian-propelled Cuba, and is disposed to do something about it. Calling the Russian-sponsored Tricontinental Conference in Havana "an act of war against the democratic institutions, the traditions, and the security and liberty of our peoples," on November 1, the Costa Rican legislature unanimously passed a resolution which reads, in part: "One: To denounce the so-called First Tricontinental Conference as an act of war; Two: To express our total solidarity with the Cuban people in their revolutionary struggle against the Communist dictatorship and recognize their right, within the island and in exile to fight freely for the restoration of their self-determination and their democracy; Three: To communicate this resolution to the Honorable President of the Republic for the official action which in his opinion is needed to carry out points One and Two; Four: To call upon the legislatures of the Free World, and especially those in Latin America, to pass resolutions similar to this and to adopt means which will preserve and develop the democratic systems of government."

According to reliable sources in Costa Rica, the U.S. Embassy tried to stop the resolution from being passed. Having failed, those same sources state, the Embassy now is bringing pressures to bear against President José Joaquín Trejos to discourage him from responding to the resolution—by, for example, providing military bases from which Cuban exiles could operate against Castro. Should Trejos resist U.S. pressures, these informants say, U.S. aid to that country would be drastically reduced.

Venezuela, one of the countries that has been attempting to modernize its military forces, has been under almost constant guerrilla assault from Cuba for a period of more than five years. Venezuelan guerrilla leaders Elias Manuit Camero, Alirio Chirinos, Alberto Pérez, and Gaspar Rojo, manage to travel to Havana and sneak back into Venezuela undetected with the ease of commuters. On November 5, Camero broadcast over Radio Havana what amounted to a declaration of guerrilla war against his own country. Three army patrols were ambushed in one night by guerrilla forces, and reports from the countryside told of momentary guerrilla control of eight interior towns and villages. One group of thirty guerrillas, dressed in the khaki uniforms and the green-and-red berets of the Castro-directed Armed Forces of National Liberation, seized the town of Sabana Grande, robbed its stores

of food and clothing and made off safely. At Campo Alegre, guerrillas forced the owner of a large ranch to flee for his life to a nearby city. His flight followed a skirmish between army units and large guerrilla forces in which the latter, led by Cuban officers, bested the Venezuelan regulars.

In a low-key announcement, Army headquarters in Caracas revealed that heavy fighting was in progress in many of the states. Army planes and helicopters were thrown into a major antiguerrilla campaign in mountainous Lara State. Similar campaigns are being carried out in varying degrees of intensity, at enormous expense to the government, in the states of Falcon, Mérida, Trujillo, Portuguesa, Monagas, Anzoategui, and Barinas. The tactics now being used by the government—use of helicopters, bombing and strafing—are almost direct copies of those employed by the United States in Vietnam. This is so because the structure and tactics of the Latin American guerrilla forces trained in Cuba are copied from the Vietcong and indeed taught by Vietcong instructors who staff many of Cuba's guerrilla training camps.

Favorite targets of the Venezuelan guerrillas are pipelines through which Venezuelan oil flows to market, and American-owned factories and stores which contribute to Venezuela's high living standard. At the end of November, urban terrorists in Caracas turned that capital city into a shambles. Six attacks were launched within a period of 24 hours, leaving destruction in their wake. A Sears Roebuck store was hit by fire bombs that destroyed most of its merchandise, and burned through its three stories. A United States Commerce Department trade fair was machine-gunned, and a U.S.-owned supermarket suffered two attacks by terrorists within a week's time. An elementary school for American children was also machine-gunned by terrorists.

Venezuelan President Raúl Leoni and his ruling Democratic Action Party are under fire because of the worsening situation. The President and his cabinet ministers have consistently sought to play down the seriousness of Venezuela's internal disorders, it is thought, so as not to add to the already considerable flight of foreign capital out of Venezuela into Swiss and other foreign banks. However, Defense Minister General Ramon Florencio Gómez was candid enough to blame the fresh outbreak on an amnesty recently extended to 31 guerrilla gangsters by President Leoni. The amazing strength shown by urban and rural guerrilla bands has raised doubts about the civilian government's ability to deal with the Communists, and rumors of a military coup are making the rounds in Caracas.

ARSENAL UNCOVERED

On December 13, Leoni was forced to declare a state of martial law. He made his decision as the result of the assassination of Army Major Francisco Astudillo Suárez and the wounding of General Roberto Morean Soto by Communist terrorists on the streets of Caracas. Believing that the Cuban-supported OCLAE was behind the assassination attempts, President Leoni sent troops into the University of Caracas where, on December 14, they uncovered an arsenal of weapons, including nineteen light machine guns, vast amounts of hand grenades, and an unspecified amount of small arms and ammunition. As a result of Cuban-exported terrorism, the administration of President Leoni has called on the Organization of American States to do something about the "subversive machinery installed in Cuba, well-financed by outside powers," and demanded "a sincere and honest examination of the policy followed by the OAS in the Cuban case . . ." Venezuelan Interior Minister Reinaldo Leandro Mora was more specific. He said: "We have specific evidence that the acts of subversion spring directly from the Tricontinental Solidarity

Conference held the beginning of this year in Havana."

LATIN REACTION

Impatience among Latin American countries with our State Department has risen to unusual heights over the past year. They are unhappy over statements which purport to see nothing of consequence in the Havana-based Tricontinental organization other than those expressed in such phrases as, "It has had the positive results of awakening Latin America to the dangers of internal subversion." As one Latin American diplomat coldly observed: "We have been alert to the danger far beyond the State Department's willingness to cope with it."

What particularly alarms Latin American governments is the conscious and conspicuous Russian leadership in the subversion of the hemisphere assumed at the Tricontinental Conference. They are disturbed that the United States did not then challenge open Soviet military intrusion in Latin America.

Latin American apprehensions have found little echo in the United States press, and the American public has been left largely uninformed of the meaning of the Tricontinental organization in Havana and of the devastation it has been wreaking in Latin America over the past year. The liberal press in this country finds in the Havana Conference little of significance beyond the confident (and unrealized) predictions that it will merely widen the Sino-Soviet split in the quest for Communist leadership in Latin America. The fact is, however, that Red China and Russia are seated cheek-by-jowl on the Conference's central strategy and policy committee in Havana—the Committee of Assistance and Aid for Peoples Fighting for their Liberation.

Newspaper editorials in Latin America express a widespread belief that the United States is playing fast and loose with the security of Latin America in exchange for an ephemeral accommodation with Russia. There is considerably more to this belief than mere conjecture. The State Department has kept mum on the subject of Russian intervention, even in the face of the OAS study which bluntly states that "the action of Russo-Chinese Communism at Havana shows the imminence of one of the most serious dangers for the hemisphere." The Russian ambassador to Havana, Alexander Alekseyev, impudently asserted that the Russians would continue to support liberation movements. Soviet Russia, he said, believes in the "firm solidarity of all the revolutionary liberation forces of the world. . . ." In broadcasts in the Quechua dialect (the native tongue of millions of Indians in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador), Radio Moscow continues to call for uprisings. Latin Americans are fully aware of the facts of the Russian intrusion into the hemisphere. For, in another Quechua Indian broadcast that preceded the Havana Tricontinental Conference, Radio Moscow boasted that 10,000 "students" from Asia, Africa, and Latin America were attending classes in revolutionary tactics at Moscow's Lumumba University. The broadcast said that the number of Latin Americans at Lumumba University is being greatly increased, since "the dawn of freedom in Latin America is now in its initial stages." Radio Moscow also said of those students that "they will fight alongside the peasants and humble people to ensure that their countries have genuine freedom."

U.S. PRESS DELINQUENT

Blasts recently issued in the United Nations by Ambassadors José Sette Camara of Brazil, Victor Andres Belaunde of Peru, and Evaristo Sourdis of Colombia, against Russia and members of the Soviet bloc for their aggressions in the Western Hemisphere, received little attention in the American press.

Nor was there the open and vigorous support from the United States which these denunciations obviously merit. A bill of particulars submitted by Sourdis, and by Ambassador Hector Escobar Serrano of El Salvador, blistered Russian-Cuban subversion, named names, and called on the UN to do something about it. But their warnings also went largely unnoticed.

The frozen attitude of the Department of State, and the failure of the American press adequately to report on the alarming situation in Latin America, was dramatically brought to light recently. In November, Panama's Dr. Eduardo Ritter, unanimously elected chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, inaugurated his one-year tenure with a speech in which he criticized the U.S. press and U.S. policymakers in unusually blunt language. He said that not only is the OAS the target of "the constant aggression of its enemies," but "of strong and dangerous aggression of silence by those who should be its best allies." Dr. Ritter continued: "The objectives of American action should be the cessation of the purges and forced labor in Cuba, the gagging and persecution, the abuse and insult." He blistered the U.S. press, saying that the activities of Latin American countries in seeking collective action against Russian-Cuban subversion "barely achieve an occasional line among the inconsequential news items."

Official Washington must share considerable blame for Dr. Ritter's charges against the American press. The State Department has done nothing to arouse press interest in the deteriorating situation in Latin America brought about by Russian-Cuban subversion. For example, when Dr. Ritter finished his blunt address, the U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, Col Linowitz, rose and delivered his own maiden speech. Its most notable passages contained an echo of Senator Robert Kennedy's outburst against the sale of arms to Latin America. In what must rank as the most colossal irrelevancy in the history of the OAS, Linowitz complained about "unnecessary" military expenditures. The State Department, it would seem, is still riveted to its social worker course. That is why, it may be surmised, the State Department has remained silent on the subject of massive subversion of our neighbors while at the same time furiously denouncing the non-predatory governments of South Africa and Rhodesia for their racial policies.

The lines have been clearly drawn. Either we must take measures adequate to the task of eradicating the Soviet base in the Caribbean, or we must face another Vietnam, in the towering Andes and the jungle heartland of Latin America, one that will make the present conflict in Asia seem insignificant by comparison. In an interview published in the January 5 issue of Castro's *Granma* newspaper, Nguyen Van Duc, head of the Vietcong mission in Havana, addressed the burgeoning "wars of national liberation" in these terms: "Within a short period of time, there will not be just one Vietnam, but many Vietnams, and the Yankees will not be able to handle so many attacks at the same time." The Ecuador newspaper, *El Universo*, scored the Cuban policy of the Johnson Administration as the consequence of an unworkable détente with Russia, saying: "While the Russians continue to seek agreements with the United States, they are not disposed to pay the price for these agreements."

It was left to Colombia's Ambassador to the UN to put the issue squarely. On December 8, Ambassador Sourdis told the UN: "If we do not arrive right now at a means to put a stop to undercutting our sovereignty and self-determination, in the near future the world will be faced with a devastating conflagration." Some indication of what Ambassador Sourdis is talking about is evident right now in Havana, where a preparatory committee of the Latin American Soli-

darity Organization is in session, preparing an agenda for the meeting of LASO in July. One purpose of the preparatory meeting, as outlined in Castro's newspaper, *Granma*, is to prepare for "common action against the ideological, political, and economic penetration of imperialism in Latin America"—a Communist program of systematic destruction. The other purpose is "to receive all information from delegates, make plans on the basis of the needs of each country, and make recommendations to the Central Committee"—in short, to study the successes and failures of last year's enormously eventful guerrilla campaigns and make adjustments which will make them even more potent in the future. Thus, when July 1967 arrives, hundreds of Communist delegates from Latin America will again make their way to Havana, under the very nose of the U.S., there to plot the next phase of the Vietnam wars in this hemisphere.

On September 13, 1962, the late President Kennedy stated: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies." There can be little question that that time has come. A new Communist International, headed by Russia and Red China, has been spawned right off the coast of Florida; and it is waging war against the United States. The global implications of this simple fact are enormous, and require considerably more than the words, only now being uttered by U.S. representatives to the United Nations, to deal with the threat. And why the United States backed the move in the OAS which placed the issue of Cuban subversion before the United Nations where, in any showdown in the Security Council it would be subject to the Russian veto, awaits a satisfactory explanation. The evidence suggests that the matter is much too serious to be resolved by our diplomats in Foggy Bottom. It should be placed in the hands of our very best military planners.

PRESS RELEASE, SEPTEMBER 27, 1965

Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa.), concerning the proposed treaties with the Republic of Panama, released the following statement today from his Washington office:

"The President's announcement on September 24, 1965, about the status of current treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, fully justify my fears for the security of our position on the Isthmus and confirm my predictions on this subject.

"It means a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a so-called dual governmental and managerial setup for it in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. This can only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extra-territorial jurisdictions where two masters are involved.

"The Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States with sovereignty granted by treaty in perpetuity and ownership of all land in the Zone obtained by private purchase at a total cost of some \$144,000,000. Our investment in the Canal enterprise and defense installations is in billions of dollars furnished by the American taxpayers but in the indicated agreements not a dollar is to be repaid to us.

"Under existing treaty, the United States is obligated to Panama for the perpetual operation and maintenance of the Canal. The issues involved in the agreements under negotiations are so grave that candor is required. Panama gets everything it desires and the United States nothing but losses and ignominy.

"The Panamanian negotiators have written

out what they demanded and our negotiators, figuratively speaking, have merely signed on the dotted line. We certainly should not have agreed to Panamanian sovereignty but, on the other hand, should have demanded the extension of the Canal Zone to include the watershed of the Chagres River.

"The grant of complete jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone, means that all laws made by the U.S. Congress for the Government of the Zone and the operation and maintenance of the Canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superseded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the Zone—Courts, Police and Fire Departments, Schools, Roads and Public Utilities—will be taken over by Panama.

"All this means, sooner or later, the elimination of United States citizen employees in the Canal enterprise with substitutions by Panamanians. It will be inevitable that all these positions will become political plums eagerly sought by Panamanian politicians with gross confusion and embarrassment. Yet, our negotiators were unable or unwilling to deal with the situation realistically and have agreed to leave our Government with responsibility without any adequate authority. Think what this means in time of war or other grave emergency? Even as to the matter of land in the Zone, which may be required for Canal purposes, we should have to buy back at exorbitant prices areas we already own by actual purchases from the owners. What a ridiculous situation!

"Panama, having secured such outstanding results in its claims, will, inevitably, demand all control over the Canal enterprise with withdrawal by the United States. If such abandonment occurs, Panama and all of Latin America will go down the communal drain.

"For our officials to proclaim that Panama, which since 1955 has not been able to collect its own garbage from the streets of Panama City and Colon, as a partner of this great interoceanic public utility, is, to say the least, unrealistic and really astounding; and it will evoke serious reactions from maritime countries as regards the fixing of tolls.

"The President's announcement, indeed, marks a sad day for the United States, although it may bring rejoicing at Peking and Moscow. He has completely yielded to the counsel of his advisers, sappers and appeasers, who must be made to bear basic responsibility for what has occurred. Moreover, I predict that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic revolutionary elements all over Latin America and the Caribbean.

"There should be only one flag flown over the Panama Canal and Zone—the flag of the United States—and the proposed treaties should be defeated."

OPEN COVENANTS OPENLY ARRIVED AT FOR PANAMA TREATY PROPOSALS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the aftermath of World War I, the people of our country heard much about President Woodrow Wilson's call for "open covenants openly arrived at" as the antidote for secret diplomacy which had preceded

that fratricidal conflict. This potent slogan applies with equal force today, especially as regards the proposed new treaties with Panama now being negotiated under conditions of the tightest secrecy.

In a recent issue of the Washington Observer Newsletter, a semimonthly periodical published in the Nation's Capital City, there are statements of unusual interest in regard to the current United States-Panama diplomatic negotiations. The assertions made therein accord with published statements to the effect that the President of the United States will shortly announce at the approaching meeting of Latin American Presidents, which it says he will attend, that a new treaty or treaties will be made with Panama to abrogate the treaty of 1903, with surrender by the United States of its authority over the Canal Zone and with what would amount to a joint United States-Panamanian management of the Panama Canal. It is obvious to informed observers that an attempt is being made through the treaty process to bring about surrenders to Panama that could never be obtained by acts of the Congress.

The article further confirms the published story that the President and his treaty advisers have pursued a policy of silence, and suppression of news concerning the proposed new treaties. The strategy behind this is to secure an immediate ratification of them by a Senate unacquainted with the complicated issues involved. This, Mr. Speaker, would not be the first time such tactics have been used in the Senate.

The importance of the Panama treaty proposals cannot be overemphasized. The future, not only of the United States but also of other countries of the Western Hemisphere, may depend on the action taken by the Senate on them. They most certainly should be dealt with by the Senate only after ample study, debate, and consideration. They should not be handled as was the suddenly sprung 1955 Eisenhower-Romon Treaty with Panama when not a single Senator was well enough versed on the subject to elucidate the facts involved and to debate with the necessary effectiveness. The consequence was that this giveaway treaty was ratified by default notwithstanding that it contained provisions highly prejudicial to the efficient control and management of the canal.

Since that time the Congress has become far better informed on interoceanic canal problems, which are now well documented as regards their most significant phases in many discussions in the Congress. Special attention is invited to a collection of addresses, which was published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, in 1966 under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions." This volume contains a wealth of carefully researched material and was distributed to all Members of the Congress. Any attempt to stampede the Senate by a surprise submission of the treaty proposals accompanied by plausible pleas of emergency will, in essence, constitute a kind of guerrilla warfare characteristic of the jungles of Vietnam, which should not prevail in the Halls of the Congress.

The taxpayers of the United States have provided billions of dollars to construct, maintain, operate, sanitize, and protect the Canal and the Canal Zone. Certainly they should be fully apprised of the effects of the proposed surrender at Panama before any votes in the Senate are taken on the treaty proposals. Anything less than such a course of action would be a base betrayal of the treaty making processes provided by the Constitution.

While the House of Representatives is granted no constitutional authority as regards treaty ratification it has nevertheless the solemn duty and obligation to be concerned with treaties negotiated by the Executive and to do what seems necessary to protect the best interests of our people. Moreover, the House has a direct responsibility with any treaty that requires appropriations by the Congress to implement it or which may affect the citizens or the taxpayers of the Nation. Hence, what is now said is in the nature of a warning to all concerned and is not inconsistent with customs involved in these connections.

The indicated article follows:

SECRET TREATY

One of the best kept White House secrets is the new Panama Canal treaty that has already been agreed upon by President Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama. Chief architect of the treaty is Walt W. Rostow, Presidential policy planner for Latin America.

LBJ, who prides himself on his skillful timing of his legislative thrusts, realizes he must stampee the unpalatable treaty through the Senate with a minimum of debate before public sentiment against it is generated.

Mr. Johnson shrewdly calculates that the proper time and setting to unveil his Panama treaty would be for him to make a spectacular announcement before the upcoming conference of Latin American Presidents; he is prodding the Latin nations to set an early date for the meeting in order to insure the election of the Robles coalition in early 1968. The President has sweetened the pie for the other Latin nations by cajoling the ruling Panamanian oligarchy into conceding preferential lower canal tolls for Latin countries and at the same time hike the tolls for European countries. And, of course, minimal tolls for Panama, thus encouraging more foreign ships to fly the Panamanian flag. LBJ will receive an ovation when he announces that he has wangled special concessions from Panama for their benefit.

Under the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty negotiated by President Theodore Roosevelt Panama receives an annuity of \$1.93 million annually. Under the new treaty the tiny Republic of Panama will receive upward of \$80 million a year. Panama's gross national product is only \$595 million.

The handful of wealthy Panamanian families that constitute the ruling oligarchy will be practically tax free under the "Panama Master Plan" and the little nation may become a tax haven for wealthy foreigners.

CUTBACK IN FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY APPORTIONMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Blanton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my district and the State of Tennessee are keenly concerned with the prospects of another cutback in Federal aid highway apportionment, this one to amount to \$400 million.

Tennessee has 526.8 miles of interstate highways open to traffic, with 178.7 miles under construction and a total of 346.1 miles which are to be built but have not been started. The initial cutback last November, which forced a reduction by 17 percent in our interstate program in Tennessee, did not have a disastrous effect on our highway building program. However, if the now proposed cutback of \$400 million goes into effect, it will cause serious economic repercussions in all segments of Tennessee's economy.

There are hundreds of people who will be thrown into unemployment if the present cutback is carried out. Many small contractors invested heavily from the profits they have made in the interstate projects in the past few years, into modern equipment. They expanded their businesses in order to meet the demands of the projects. They assumed that the projects would be carried out on schedule as planned by both State and Federal Government agencies.

The cutback drastically changes the schedule and scientific programing of the interstate project in our State. The Tennessee Highways Department coordinates its plans with those of many State departments; for example, revenue, industrial development.

Furthermore, the Governor's office has reported that all elements of the State's economy will be affected, and especially the 38 Tennessee counties designated by the Economic Development Administration as economically depressed areas.

Good roads mean employment opportunities in industrial areas of our State. The mountainous terrain of our State makes many rural roads hazardous. The Interstate System, which is designed to crisscross the 503-mile length of Tennessee, makes it easier for people in rural poverty areas to reach industrial employment opportunities in urban areas.

Furthermore, many industries have indicated a willingness to settle in some of these rural areas of the State under the presumption that the Interstate Highway System will reach that area in the near future, which would enable them to maintain the adequate transportation system industries demand.

We are fully aware that the cutbacks will merely delay the Interstate Highway System, rather than to end it completely. But I submit that these delays will effect thousands of Tennesseans adversely because our State and our citizens have anticipated no further cutbacks, and the strain of our economy will be a profound one.

I have mentioned the economic burdens this cutback will cause our citizens, but there is another important issue involved. It is one of highway safety. The National Safety Council has reported that interstate highway deaths number more than one-third less than automobile accidents on other highways. Tennessee, in 1966, ranked 13th in the United States in number of traffic fatalities.

Indications are that the rate of fatalities in our State are continuing on this unprecedented high course. The slowdown in the interstate building in Tennessee, promulgated by the cutbacks in appropriations, will affect the safety of all the motoring public, and is of great concern to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there are numerous other programs which involve State and Federal matching funds, which will be in danger in the States, because of the cutbacks in this program. Having served in the State legislature, I know there will be those using this cutback as an excuse to vote against appropriations for other matching fund programs. They will say, "Why appropriate moneys when the overall program we are voting for might be curtailed or even stopped?"

I believe it would be unwise to have any further cutback in the interstate program appropriations at this time. I believe there are many other programs where we can carve unnecessary fat from, thus leaving this program as it now stands.

REGENTS' JOB NOT TO BARGAIN AWAY STANDARDS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to my colleagues in the House an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee of February 20, 1967, entitled "Regents' Job Is Not To Bargain Away Standards."

The leadership of the University of California in the academic world has long been a source of pride for all Californians. I have serious concern, however, whether or not the high academic excellence of this institution will be undermined by the budgetary and tuition policies promulgated by the current Republican administration in California.

The editorial follows:

REGENTS' JOB IS NOT TO BARGAIN AWAY STANDARDS

University of California regents rejected—and rightly—the proposal by Gov. Ronald Reagan that they impose a tuition this fall but they compromised their own standards—they should not have—in bargaining with the governor on the budget.

The rejection of the tuition means no tuition can be imposed before the spring of 1968, thus leaving the issue in debate. The scaling down of the UC budget request to \$255 million, this while voting to use \$19 million from its special fund toward the university's operation to help ease the emergency, will force the university to turn away some 3,500 students it otherwise would have accepted.

So for the first time in almost a century of operation, the university must recant on its stated goal to provide "every qualified student" with an educational opportunity. No longer can California say it offers that maximum opportunity—and this is the state which boasts it has greater blessings in resources, in wealth and in adventurous people than any state in the Union.

Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh, a member of the Board of Regents by virtue of his legislative office, came the closest to speaking for the concerned when he cautioned the board, to paraphrase—

That it is the board's responsibility to declare needs, not to bargain away standards.

That the issue of money is a political problem and therefore the problem of the governor and of the legislature.

That the board should indicate how much it needs to run the university and stick to it, and that anything short of this fails the university and the regents' responsibility.

Unruh thus emphasized the real areas of authority and duty.

It is as he suggested—the responsibility of the regents is to speak for the university needs and not to bargain away standards or educational opportunity.

If in the end there just is not the money to finance such opportunity—this becomes an issue for public decision through the legislature.

Surely the turning away of 3,500 students, otherwise qualified, does not represent faithful stewardship.

Surely the bargaining away of so basic a university standard as open-door opportunity makes a mockery of the state's master plan for higher education—which has as its first predication the determination to furnish a seat for all who can qualify.

SPY HYSTERIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer has put the Central Intelligence Agency-National Student Association affair into perspective in a recent editorial.

The actions of the CIA and the NSA appear to the writer and, I may add, to myself—as patriotic, not reprehensible.

These organizations were combating the effort by international communism to subvert student groups all over the world.

We were forced to fight fire with fire—and we did so successfully.

The Inquirer states the case in terms for Philadelphia—and the rest of the country—with this observation:

We happen to live in a jungle world, not in some Utopia where a country's intelligence service can operate in full view of the public at Broad and Chestnut Streets.

I include this fine editorial as a permanent part of the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE HYSTERIA

The outcry following disclosure that the Central Intelligence Agency had helped finance the National Student Association has been almost hysterically out of all proportion to the actual situation.

All kinds of sinister motives have been read into the CIA's connection with the student organization, with the implication that young people have been corrupted by Government subsidy and used as spies or in some other outlandish capacity.

Not surprisingly, critics of President Johnson, whether those opposed to him politically or those who take the left-wing line in any matter having to do with foreign policy, have seized upon the CIA-Student

Association affair to make the President the target of new attack.

At the same time, America's Intelligence Service has been made to appear as though it were engaged in some nefarious conspiracy, with students as their tools.

On the part of those who support international Communism and who oppose U.S. foreign policy at all times, such tactics are understandable. But there is no sensible reason for others to join in this uproar. We happen to live in a jungle world, not in some Utopia where a country's intelligence service can operate in full view of the public at Broad and Chestnut streets.

A calm appraisal of the oversensationalized disclosure of the National Student Association subsidies will make the hullabaloo of the past week seem ridiculous.

After questioning CIA Director Richard Helms, a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee issued a statement saying that the CIA aid was given, at the student's request, to counter Communist attempts to take over foreign student organizations, by making it possible for American students holding independent views to participate in international meetings.

"It is no secret," the statement continued, "that since the end of the Second World War, the Communists concentrated on student organizations throughout the free world and by 1950 were successful to the point that they had little opposition. Patriotic and worried students in the U.S. were quick to recognize the situation. Leaders of their organization sought appropriate help. It was forthcoming, and has now served its purpose. Espionage was not involved: the survival of freedom was."

The intent of the CIA aid was patriotic; to help resist the inroads made by international Communism. What is the intent of those who are trying to defame and to belittle the CIA, and to embarrass the Government of the U.S. with their outcries over the student subsidy incident? Certainly they are giving aid and comfort only to our enemies.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES A BILL TO CHANGE THE OCCUPATIONAL DEFINITION FOR OLDER WORKERS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which will help answer a question which has plagued us and our offices for years. It is probably the question most frequently asked about the social security disability program. The question is:

I have suffered a disabling injury which makes it impossible for me to continue to work. Why am I not entitled to disability benefits?

In answer to such a letter we have pointed out that the law requires that you must be disabled for any substantial gainful activity and that just because you cannot work at your previous occupation does not, as such, qualify you for benefits. We point out that the law is stricter than most staff retirement systems, such as civil service, which require that you only suffer a disability which

prevents you from doing the work you previously did. Last year's Committee on Ways and Means report stated:

In line with the original views expressed by your committee and since reaffirmed, to be eligible an individual must demonstrate that he is not only unable, by reason of a physical or mental impairment, to perform the type of work he previously did, but that he is also unable, taking into account his age, education, and experience, to perform any other type of substantial gainful work, regardless of whether or not such work is available to him in the locality in which he lives.

I find it particularly difficult to explain this test to older workers. For most of them inability to work at their old jobs means inability to work at all. Vocational rehabilitation for them is much more difficult than for younger workers. Moreover, it seems to me a trifle harsh to impose a test that requires them to leave their homes of a lifetime to seek "theoretical" employment in other parts of the country.

I think the Congress recognized the harshness of this provision last year when it adopted, in the conference committee, a provision that individuals aged 55 or over who are "blind"—as defined in the law—may qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations.

The bill I introduce would merely extend this test to all persons age 55 or over, whether blind or not, so as to entitle them to benefits if their disability is such as to prevent them from engaging in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with some regularity and over a substantial period of time.

The adoption of this "occupational" definition for our older workers will bring more realism and justice to the social security disability program. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to study this legislation and present it to the Congress in the near future.

UNDERPAYMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which will remove a technicality in the social security law which is causing considerable hardship to a good many people. The Social Security Administration acknowledges that there has been an underpayment of benefits in some 67,000 cases but maintains that it cannot pay out this money to those who should rightfully receive it because of the provisions of existing law. In 1 week alone—January 7 to January 13 of last year—over 3,400 complaints were received by the Social Security Administration as to this provi-

sion. About 100 of them were from my State of Florida.

The situation in brief is this. The Social Security Administration in the past had been authorizing payments to surviving beneficiaries of the unpaid benefits of a deceased beneficiary. To do this they had been interpreting broadly the phrase in section 204(a) in the law which authorized such payments "whenever an error has been made." In the face of a number of court decisions, they concluded they could no longer make such payments to the eligible survivors—usually the widow—and that such payments had to be paid to a legal representative. The cost of obtaining underpayments through a legal representative in many jurisdictions exceeded the amount of the underpayments. More than half of the underpayments are under \$100 and about 35 percent of the cases involve amounts of \$50 or less.

No particular problem is involved where an estate is one that must be probated, but in case of small estates, in States with no small estate statutes, the complicated and costly procedure is not worth the meager receipts.

In view of this situation the administration presented remedial legislation to the Committee on Finance during its consideration of the social security amendments last year. The amendment, which was adopted by the committee, would have allowed disposition of the underpayment according to regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare "in such order of priority as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title." Presumably the conference committee found this delegation of authority a little too broad and modified it in two ways: First, by limiting its applicability to cases where the amount does not exceed a month's benefit of the deceased beneficiary; and second, by providing that payment would go to the surviving spouse living with the beneficiary, but if there was no spouse, then to the legal representative. This brings us up to the present situation where approximately 67,000 cases—mostly children but some widows—are not getting these payments because they cannot meet these rigid requirements of the law which make the appointment of a legal representative a *sine qua non*.

The bill I introduce today meets the objections of the conference committee. It is similar to the bill of Senators MONDALE and HARRIS (S. 3681). My bill will provide that in the case of amounts less than \$1,000 the money due will be distributed according to a list of priority spelled out in the law, not in HEW regulation. This meets the objection to the original Administration proposal that it was too broad a delegation of probate power. Under my bill payments would be first made to the surviving spouse. If there is no spouse, then payment would be made to the surviving children in equal parts. Finally, if there were no spouse or children, payment would go to the legal representative but, if none had been appointed after a 3-month period, then it would go to the persons who would take under the laws of the State for intestate succession in such amounts

as prescribed by such laws. If the amount involved is over \$1,000 the amount would have to go to the legal representative. This, in my view, provides a workable and equitable solution in a context which preserves the basic probate prerogatives of the States.

Mr. Speaker, social security is unique among the Government social insurance systems in requiring such payments to the legal representatives. Amounts of underpayments of deceased beneficiaries under civil service, military retirement, and veterans' programs are distributed according to priorities set forth in statutes. The Railroad Retirement Board pays such amounts first to the surviving spouse, and then on the basis of equitable entitlement to persons paying the decedent's burial expenses. I urge early consideration of this important amendment.

MEDICARE FOR THE DISABLED

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last year brought about the establishment of the first national health insurance program in the United States when the medicare bill for the aged went into effect on July 1, as a result of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. I found a great deal of satisfaction out of the experience of going to Independence, Mo., to be with Presidents Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson for the signing of this historic legislation. For it was my privilege, 20 years ago, to be selected as one of Mr. Truman's chief advocates of the health insurance principle as a means of increasing the economic security of Americans. I stated then my belief that "the national health-insurance principle is a wise, sound, and thoroughly American principle to apply to the health needs of the people."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Congress, first session, May 7, page 4679. I have always been particularly proud of the fact that, in his health message to Congress in 1945, President Truman referred specifically to the findings of my Subcommittee on Education on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor with respect to the health needs of the American people in calling for his national health insurance program.

Because of some of the bitter charges which were made against such legislation in those early days, I may say I also take particular pride in the fact that few legislative proposals have been enacted with so clear a mandate from the American people themselves—for medicare was a key issue in the 1964 campaign. President Johnson repeatedly described it as being on the top of the list of his must legislation. And the people spoke. We have, then, achieved a health insurance program in this country for those of our people 65 and over who, for this reason,

have less opportunity—as years of experience have shown—to purchase the kind of health insurance they need through private means.

I rise today, however, on behalf of another group of Americans who, I am convinced, should also have been given the right to the kind of medical care we are now committed to provide for people 65 and over. I refer to those people who are drawing social security benefits today because they have been retired from the labor force by a crippling total disability.

I am not alone in this conviction. The report of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which appeared on January 1, 1965, following over a year's deliberations recommended that hospital benefits be provided for the disabled as well as for the aged. In their words:

Hospital expenses are a serious problem for the totally disabled, too. Like the aged, they, too, are hospitalized frequently and in many cases their hospital stays are long. According to a survey of workers (50 and over) found disabled under the social security disability provisions (conducted by the Social Security Administration in 1960), about one out of five disability beneficiaries under social security received care in short-stay hospitals in the survey year; and, excluding hospitalizations in long-term institutions, half of those hospitalized were in the hospital for 3 weeks or more.

Pointing to the fact that health care has become so expensive that only the relatively well-off person at the height of his earning power can afford to pay the cost of a major, prolonged illness without effective insurance, the Council added this pertinent sentence:

And the great majority of the aged and the disabled are neither well off nor have adequate health insurance.

I would point out that the members of this Advisory Council were broadly representative of American business, labor, and economic and social conscience. To illustrate this point I want, at this time, to name and identify the 13 members of the Council—a group appointed in line with legislation enacted by the Congress to provide a periodic review not only of the financing of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program but also all other aspects of the program, including extensions of coverage and the adequacy of benefits:

Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, Chairman.

J. Douglas Brown, dean of the faculty, Princeton University.

Kenneth W. Clement, M.D., practicing physician and immediate past president, National Medical Association.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director, department of social security, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

James P. Dixon, M.D., president, Antioch College.

Loula F. Dunn, director, American Public Welfare Association, 1949-64.

Marion B. Folsom, director and former treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

Gordon M. Freeman, president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Reinhard A. Hohaus, director, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and fellow, Society of Actuaries.

Arthur Larson, director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University.

Herman M. Somers, professor of politics and public affairs, Princeton University.

John C. Virden, chairman of the board, Eaton Manufacturing Co.

Leonard Woodcock, vice president, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modest proposal for the extension of medicare coverage involving relatively few people, all of whom have already experienced the misfortune of having a crippling illness or injury and, for this reason, are unable to continue in their job. Of the 20.7 million people now receiving social security benefits they total only some 930,000 people, less than 5 percent of all beneficiaries.

For some reason I cannot really understand why we have, throughout the history of social security, been tardy in recognizing the particular problem of this group—perhaps because they are small in number. Back in 1947, the bill I sponsored would have paid benefits to severely disabled in the same way benefits were then being paid to people retired from the labor force because of age. But not until almost a decade later, in the Social Security Amendments of 1956, did they become eligible for the cash benefits, and then only if they were aged 50 and over. We have since provided them with benefits, regardless of their age, and made their dependents also eligible for benefits—but this rounding out of the program took another 4 years.

I hope that this Congress will see the wisdom of extending the benefits of the medicare program to this group within the next few months, so that they may be qualified for these important benefits along with the aged when the programs went into effect this July. To this end, I am again introducing a bill to this effect. I remind you that no new administrative machinery will be required since the social security people are already charged with the responsibility for making the determination as to whether or not they are so severely disabled as to be entitled to cash benefits. Under my legislation, once that determination has been made, they would be eligible for the benefits already established for people 65 and over. I urge every Member of Congress to consult his conscience in this matter, for I am convinced that such consideration would produce wide support for my proposal.

THE ELECTRIC CAR IDEA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report a situation in which one of our outstanding power companies is making a great contribution toward the development of the car of the future.

The West Penn Power Co., serving my

district, is one of the leaders in this field of research and progress.

The electric car has always intrigued many of us and with the great anxiety about air pollution, its development has become not only a necessity, but in reality, an emergency.

The articles that follow should be read by every Member of Congress:

[From *Electric World*, Dec. 12, 1966]

ELECTRIC CAR IDEA IS OUT FRONT AGAIN

On a road in western Pennsylvania, a couple of weeks ago, passersby were startled to see a snappy, fire-engine-red, strange-looking car scooting past them. What amazed them mainly, however, was that it was quiet, and it emitted no fumes clouding up the country air.

At the wheel was *Electrical World's* Pittsburgh Correspondent Lou Gomolak, who commented when he ended his run, "It's a quiet dream to drive and I wouldn't mind getting one."

When such a car can be purchased is pure speculation at this point, for the car Gomolak was driving was West Penn Power Co.'s prototype model of an electric car—the Allelectric.

West Penn is not going into the electric car production business. Spearheaded by Vice President W. E. Sturm, its only aim is to prove that a satisfactory electric car can and should be produced.

In recent months these other developments also indicated a revival of interest in the electric car:

Fourteen electric utilities have kicked in additional dollars to the Edison Electric Institute-General Atomic research on a high-energy-density, zinc-air battery;

Government, state, and city officials concerned over the increasing problem of air pollution, have called for a substitute for the gasoline-powered automobile;

Ford Motor Co. next spring will test prototypes of an electric car and is developing a lightweight, sodium-sulfur battery;

General Motors and Chrysler reported they were also looking at the electric car's potential, but expressed doubts about producing a practical one in the near future;

Great Britain, which already has about 40,000 electric vehicles in service, is running various tests on electric cars;

A Japanese utility is developing an electric car in cooperation with a battery manufacturer.

Most of previous attempts in recent years to market a practical electric car were little more than conversions of existing gasoline-powered vehicles. This usually resulted in a car that was overweight, structurally weak, and had very limited speed and range.

West Penn Power, part of the Allegheny Systems, has designed its car around available battery supplies but used techniques that other experimenters did not have or did not apply.

For instance, West Penn designed its own speed-control system using solid-state materials. It is also planning to use regenerative braking, which will restore some of the charge of the batteries by coasting downhill. Top speed of the Allelectric is 50 mph and it has a range of 50 mi between recharges.

For the time being, West Penn is keeping design of its electronic control and recharging circuitry secret. Transistors and silicon-controlled rectifiers are used and efficiency is "20% higher than any system we know of," said Earl deChambeau, manager of the utility's Connellsville meter department, where the car was designed and built.

Power-saving scr's are used in circuitry. The battery charging device is a pulsed-scr type with a peak rating of 25 amp.

The basic car used by the utility was a Volkswagen. The control equipment is predicated on designs used on industrial trucks and golf carts. The silicon-controlled-recti-

fier is basically the variable-pulse-width, variable-pulse-frequency type controlling a 7.1-hp, power-traction motor at 72-v, 88-amp, and a top rpm of 3,055. Road speed is infinitely variable to 2,444 rpm when full power is automatically applied.

The drive system is from the motor through the gear box and differential to the rear wheels.

The prototype cost \$2,000, including \$460 for its six, 12-v, lead-acid, medium-duty truck batteries. Curb weight is 2,160 lb, including 945 lb of batteries. Sturm believes, however, that design refinements will cut the weight and price "far below" present levels.

Capacity of the batteries is 205 amp-hr, with a 20-hr discharge rate, plus an auxiliary battery to operate such parts as the lights and windshield wipers.

The batteries can be recharged through a wall plug. However, West Penn has also modified a conventional parking meter by adding an ordinary two-pronged, 110/117v ac, wall socket.

A 100% recharge takes eight hr. However, Sturm believes the market for the Allelectric would be as a second car. For example, a housewife could drive 12 mi to a shopping center, using 25% of charge, and plug into the nearest parking meter. If she returned two hr later the batteries would be completely recharged.

A factor going for the Allelectric is its low cost per kwhr. It needs only 25 kwhr to fully recharge. At 1¢ per kwhr, operating cost is less than 1/2¢ per mi so far under actual road conditions.

Sturm is also high on the electric car because he believes it could help eliminate air pollution, irritating noise, weather troubles, and danger of explosion in case of a crash.

He reiterated that West Penn is not in the car manufacturing business. "We sell power, and this type of car will sell more of it. All we want to do is prove where the truth lies among the smoke clouding electric cars."

ELECTRIC CAR HAS NEW LOAD POTENTIAL

Other utilities should take note of the tremendous load potential in the electric car.

The Allelectric takes 25 kwhr to fully recharge its batteries. Ford estimates a Falcon-size vehicle, equipped with a 500-lb, sodium-sulfur battery, will use about 75 kwhr in recharging. And, Japan's Chubu Electric Power Co, which is also developing an electric car, estimates that each one would consume \$140 of electric power per year.

One of the main reasons for resurgence of interest in the electric car is because of the potential contribution toward solution of the air pollution problem.

During recent discussions on pollution, John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, remarked that projected increases in the number of conventional cars would eventually wipe out any improvements to be expected from his department's new program against auto exhaust pollution.

Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.) feels that if every gasoline-powered vehicle could be converted to electric battery power, about half of the total air pollution problem could vanish overnight.

To speed this, Magnuson recently introduced a bill in Congress to help promote rapid development of electric vehicles.

He proposed a three-fold thrust:

1. Build prototype vehicles to demonstrate their ability to perform tasks presently done by combustion-type vehicles;
2. Develop lightweight, powerful batteries and fuel cells;
3. Develop a vehicle specifically designed for propulsion by these sources.

Several groups are now doing something about the electric car's potential in defeating air pollution.

The main emphasis in these efforts revolves around developing a satisfactory battery for the new electrics.

In May 1964, Edison Electric Institute,

with General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp., entered joint sponsorship of a research and development program on a high-energy-density, zinc-air storage battery. EEI believes vehicles using the zinc-air battery would have a long, useful life and would operate quietly, thus contributing to a reduction of air pollution, as well as lowering urban noise levels.

The objective of the EEI-General Atomic program is to develop a high-capacity storage battery with substantially less weight per kwhr than is available in industrial storage batteries.

Under study is a zinc-air battery with an energy storage density four to five times greater than now available.

The zinc-air concept offers many potential advantages for several types of vehicles now powered by internal combustion engines. The concept also has advantages over present types of battery-powered vehicles which have limited range because of the heavy weight of their electrical storage system.

Fourteen utilities, which originally underwrote the research program, recently contributed another \$150,000.

And Ford Motor Co has intensified a four-year-old program of battery research because of the mounting needs to solve the problems of air pollution.

Ford claims its battery makes feasible adequate motive power for electric cars for the first time in 30 years.

The heart of the new battery system is the electrolyte—a crystalline ceramic that selectively passes ions while containing all other liquids, including the sodium and sulfur reactants.

Ford claims the battery can store up to 15 times the energy of present batteries and deliver about three times more discharge rate. This capacity, it said, could increase the potential range of small electric vehicles five-to-ten times that available with present batteries.

[From *Electric World*, Jan. 9, 1967]

ELECTRIC CARS UTILITIES MUST BE IN DRIVER'S SEAT

There has been a great deal of publicity of late about the possible return of the electric car. However, what has been lacking in most of the stories in national media is any mention whatsoever of the role electric utilities will play in this effort to develop a practical, workable electric car that the public will accept.

Are electric utilities going to sit back and wait to pull in what could be an attractive load? Or are they going to get in the front seat and help spur this development?

We believe they must join in and that they have a two-fold responsibility. First there is this need to push development. Secondly, and just as important, there is the responsibility to see that the electric car model which the industry finally stamps as practical is a quality product, one that is better than the public's present means of transportation for specified uses. The industry cannot afford to be associated with an electric car that is an overnight success but a failure in the long run.

Of all the groups which should be interested in seeing the electric car back on the road, utilities stand to gain the most. There would be the increased load, the bulk of it off-peak, while the cars are being recharged overnight. Then there would be the beneficial effect of cutting down air pollution. With the mounting furor over increasing pollution, utilities are being called on to show they are lessening the problem, not contributing to them. A concerted drive by utilities to help develop the electric car would show the industry wants to help eliminate pollution.

Our report on the electric car [EW, Dec. 12, 1966, p 73] showed some utilities are actively

working now on the problems which previously plagued electric car development.

One is West Penn Power Co which has developed an electric car prototype which has now been road tested and licensed. Not only does the car work, but it has achieved speeds of 50 mph and can go 50 miles between recharges.

Fourteen other utilities are also doing something concrete about electric car development. These utilities recently contributed more than \$150,000 to accelerate the zinc-air battery research program co-sponsored by Edison Electric Institute and the General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp.

Before Congress adjourned last year, four bills had been introduced in Congress calling for Government sponsorship of electric vehicle research. The American Public Power Assn, through its Electric Vehicle Committee, is pushing for early enactment of this legislation.

Beyond these actions there are several things all electric utilities can do to speed the development of a practical electric car. Among them are:

Contribute knowledge and dollars to the research programs;

Point out to civic groups and local governments how electric cars could help lessen urban noise and air pollution;

Test, promote, and buy practical electric cars as they are developed.

Recently, various other groups have announced they are looking at the electric car. While help from all quarters is welcome, we feel the onus falls heavily on the shoulders of electric utilities. They stand to gain the most. They should be in the driver's seat.

IN SEARCH OF A POSITION

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope all our colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—had an opportunity to read and reflect on Mr. David Broder's article in the Washington Post of last Wednesday, February 22, describing Governor Romney's confrontation with the press last week in Idaho. This occurred during the noncandidate's noncampaign swing through five western States.

For those who may have missed Mr. Broder's article, I include an excerpt from it as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. The excerpt follows:

The climax of the exchange came when he was asked to give a specific instance of the "political expediency" he had charged influenced Administration foreign policy.

"No, I will not," he said.

"Why not?"

"I do not choose to."

"You just make a charge and do not substantiate it?" the reporter asked.

"At this point," was Romney's reply.

I tried to think of something to say about that exchange, Mr. Speaker, but I have decided the Governor's words speak for themselves. I think they tell us a great deal.

Governor Romney's forthright and fearless statements on our foreign policy have prompted editorial comment in a

number of newspapers in recent weeks. One of the better editorials I have read on this subject appeared in the Washington Evening Star last Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Star's editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 23, 1967]

ROMNEY'S OPTIONS

George Romney, the non-candidate in search of a presidential nomination, has at long last broken his silence and spoken out on the subject of Vietnam. He didn't say much, to be sure, but the very fact that he has seen fit to address himself, however vaguely, to that knotty problem can only be considered a step in the right direction.

The substance of the governor's remarks on Vietnam seems to boil down to a slashing attack on President Johnson for having made up his mind about certain courses of action. This decision-making process is referred to by Romney as option closing, which, it seems, is a bad thing. For example:

"Once we had the option of getting involved in a large-scale land war in Southeast Asia. Now we don't."

"Once we had the option to bomb or not to bomb. Now we don't."

"Johnson's peace options are being frittered away..."

It is, admittedly, difficult to determine from the foregoing whether Romney is distressed over the nation's failure to get involved in a large-scale land war in Asia (which seems hard to believe) or if he believes that the United States is already in a "large-scale land war." Equally obscure are the reasons why he believes that the administration is irrevocably committed to continue the bombing. And exactly what "peace options" are and just how they have been "frittered away" is anybody's guess.

Still and all, the fact that Romney has stuck a tentative toe into the murky waters of Vietnam policy gives promise for the future. Perhaps, with the passage of time, he will see fit to close a few options of his own, thereby giving some clue as to where he stands on this major issue.

And when he does, the Republican party will be in a better position to exercise some of its important options. Like deciding who should run for president in 1968.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is a small country in northeastern Europe, one of the three Baltic countries on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population just under 2 million, it has always been among the smallest of European countries, and the Estonian people have figured as one of the smallest of nationality groups in all Europe. But to these gallant, hardy, and stalwart souls, whose past history is full of great and glorious deeds, their numerical inferiority has not been a serious handicap. This they have amply proved in the course of their long and turbulent history in their cold but beautiful homeland. They have been sturdy defenders

of their centuries-old traditions and ideals, and have faced their far more powerful foes, invariably many times more numerous, with courage, and determination, firmly convinced that theirs was a righteous and sacred cause. In the course of their history, when it became impossible for them to maintain their national independence and had to admit defeat, they refused to bend their knees to their conquerors and overlords, thus proving their greatness even in defeat.

In the early 18th century Estonia became part of the czarist Russian empire, and the Estonians proved the most irrevocable subjects of the czars. For this reason they were subjected to harsh treatment in the hands of callous Russian officials. They were cruelly persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and advocated, and they were held down under the oppressive regime. But these dauntless fighters for their freedom and liberty could not be silenced and subdued. With uncommon tenacity they clung to their ideals until the time came for their liberation. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the Bolsheviks, the Estonians saw their chance, seized upon it and proclaimed their national independence on February 24, 1918. That was 49 years ago.

During the interwar years the Estonians enjoyed real freedom in their homeland under their own democratic government. They worked hard and succeeded in making their reborn state one of the most advanced, industrialized, and progressive countries in all eastern Europe. They leaped forward on every front, especially in educational, social, and economic fields, and for a while many highly educated Estonians became dedicated international civil servants, working in the League of Nations. Of course they also guarded their newly won freedom against their actual and potential foes as best they could. They were fully aware of the difficult predicament which was their lot, and had no choice but hope for the favorable turn of international events. Then came the world cataclysm in 1939, and the ensuing war proved most disastrous to the Estonian people.

Very early in the war the Soviet Government used veiled tactics to overawe and then actually to bring the Estonian Government to submit to Soviet overlordship of the country. By mid-1940 the country was overrun and occupied by the Red army, putting an end to the independent Estonian state and making it part of the Soviet Union. Thus after enjoying freedom for only two decades, these freedom-loving and absolutely innocent people were once more robbed of their freedom and found themselves under the unrelenting regime of Communist tyranny.

During the course of the war the Estonians for a while exchanged their Communist masters for Nazi overlords, but that did not change their unhappy lot; they suffered under both tyrannies. Toward the end of the war Communists returned with added force and fury, and to this day they remain there. For more than two decades, since 1945, they have

turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians live, work, and perforce endure the abominable yoke of Communist totalitarianism. For a long time they were effectively cut off from the free world, and at times their movements were restricted even within their own country. Fortunately, this situation has changed somewhat for the better. Today Estonia is at least partly open to tourists from the West, and a relatively few Estonians are allowed to make short visits abroad. Their means of livelihood have improved, and they do not suffer as much under the minions of the Kremlin. The gradual thawing of the cold war, and the relative improvement of East-West international relations have thus brought some windfall to the people of Estonia. But they are still far from free, and of course cherish their national independence with undiminished fervor. On the occasion of their 49th independence day I hope and pray that soon they attain their national goal and live in peace in their homeland.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson issued to this Nation a most perceptive message on our Nation's youth. Giving the importance of youth to our future as a nation, this message certainly deserves our most careful attention.

I most strongly favor the President's decision to establish a Cabinet-level Council, headed by the Vice President, to promote summer programs for young Americans. The President outlined his plans for making the long summer a time for constructive activity for our young people by providing them with access to recreation and to summer jobs. In such a context, our older youngsters can work with young children during the summer, teaching, supervising, and caring for them in various activities.

Last summer, Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees, between age 16 and 21, made an invaluable contribution to the President's youth opportunity campaign. They worked with children in recreational facilities, in libraries, and at camps and parks. Indeed, the NYC youth were helping enrich the lives of younger children at the same time they were earning money for return to school in the fall. Such programs need and deserve our continued support.

The President also asked the Congress to support a wide range of services for these child and parent centers in areas of acute poverty, including health, nutrition, and counseling in household management, accident prevention, and infant care.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, with

its young men and women enrollees, could be an important source of manpower for these centers. NYC enrollees serve as health aids, day-care center aids, and as counseling and recreation aids. This type of service is not new to the young men and women who make up the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In programs in every part of the Nation, they have proven their ability to work with younger children in Headstart programs and in the President's youth opportunity campaign. NYC enrollees have served as recreational, health, teachers' and nurses' aids. They have worked in rehabilitation centers and in centers for the handicapped. By these outstanding efforts the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been able to contribute its services for the betterment of our children who tomorrow must wear the mantle of leadership.

This NYC program, as well as the other Labor Department work-training programs, constitutes a vital weapon in our fight against poverty and is a great asset in improving the quality of our society.

UNWAVERING COMMITMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson has earned the title of "Civil Rights President."

He has done more than any other President in this century to make equality a living principle of this country. The remarkable civil rights legislation and its encouraging effect are a tribute to his belief and his perseverance.

If any doubts as to his personal commitment still linger, as the Washington Post states in a fine editorial, the message on civil rights ought to dispel them.

As the newspaper says, Mr. Johnson has renewed the national commitment in a way that leaves no room for doubt.

I enter this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1967]

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITMENT

The President's Civil Rights message ought to extinguish the last lingering remnant of skepticism about his unwavering commitment to the principle of equality and the practical proposals available to achieve it.

It is a long message. And it contains a lot of homely truths that it should not be necessary to repeat at this stage of the Nation's history. But the experience of the last session showed clearly enough that the Congress had either forgotten or did not ever know some of the facts of life that the President recited. And it revealed plainly enough that repetition of first principles still is necessary.

The proposals themselves are perfecting and improving devices for existing programs, for the most part. It is difficult to see how Congress could seriously object to most of them. The President has used great skill and persuasive talent to try to bring around those who opposed the fair housing proposal last session. Whether his three-stage plan is more palatable than his one-jump plan remains to be seen, but it shows his desire to

be conciliatory and his old urge to find a consensus.

The country still has far to go to achieve its goals and purposes. The progress which the President detailed is impressive, but it counsels no diminishing of our exertions.

Important as his legislative proposals are, it is quite clear that it is equally important to have the President of the United States, year after year, reaffirm the broad principles on which the country stands. President Johnson has succeeded in getting Congress to approve more civil rights measures than any other Administration in our history. He still is at work on that legislative program. But perhaps, even more significant, is the fact that he has renewed the national commitment in a way that leaves no room for doubt.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as liberty-loving Americans who are dedicated to the cause of freedom and democracy, it is but right and proper that we pause during our legislative duties to take note of a brave people's fight for independence.

Forty-nine years ago, a group of patriots across the seas declared the independence of their country and established, against great odds, the Republic of Estonia. Their ancestors have lived along the Baltic Sea for thousands of years and have always been considered as a distinct, hardworking, religious, and energetic people. Their independence, however, was of short duration.

On June 17, 1940, Soviet troops invaded Estonia and the Communists stamped out that unfortunate country's freedom. With utter disregard for human life and human values, the Reds cruelly deported about 120,000 Estonians from their ancient homeland and replaced them with hostile people from other parts of the Soviet Union. There are indications that as many as 60,000 Estonians were killed during the first Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in 1940-41.

It is quite well known that the Russians employed a very vicious policy to eliminate the distinctive nationality of the Baltic people by scattering them to the four winds. The present sad fate of Estonia represents one of the great tragedies of modern times—the complete enslavement of formerly free people by the neocolonialistic imperialism of the U.S.S.R.

The reality of the Iron Curtain as a barrier remains. For over 15 years, U.S. foreign correspondents were almost completely excluded from Estonia and other Baltic countries. It signifies a failure on the part of the Soviet system to reach its goals and to provide a successful competition with the free world for the minds and loyalties of the captives behind that barrier.

It should also be remembered that the Soviet Government has signed treaties of nonaggression with Estonia and other Baltic nations—and then systematically invaded the countries whose integrity it had solemnly promised to respect. The U.S.S.R. then physically annexed these nations and forcibly incorporated them into the cluster of its "Socialist Republics." So far as the Communists are concerned, Estonia has ceased to exist as a separate country entitled to her own national identity and independence.

I wish to invite to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress that to this day, the United States fully accords diplomatic recognition to the representatives of this great Baltic State. Here, I submit, is positive proof of our dedication to the cause of freedom and of our belief in the right of self-determination of separate and independent nations, even though they might presently be subjugated.

By noting this day, we give notice to the entire world that we trust in the not too distant future, Estonia will again take its rightful place among the community of free and independent sovereign nations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on March 6, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on March 7; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 60 minutes, on February 28, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEGLE, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 20 minutes, on Tuesday, February 28, 1967.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. GUDE), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GUDE), for 10 minutes, on February 28; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GUDE), for 30 minutes, on March 1; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. POAGE and to include an address by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUDE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. HANLEY.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

416. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

417. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report of all expenditures during the period July 1 to December 31, 1966, from moneys appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on Appropriations.

418. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89-754, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

419. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the financing of the operations of the Bureau of the Mint, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

420. A letter from the junior past national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., Medford, Oreg., transmitting the minutes of the annual national convention of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-654; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

421. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

422. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in the procurement of spare aircraft parts for outfitting aircraft carriers, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

423. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through constructing rather than leasing housing at Brewerville, Liberia, for U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

424. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a re-

port of savings available through expanded use of regional contracts for the repair and maintenance of selected office machines, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

425. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings available in manpower costs of railway post offices, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

426. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Board covering fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 205 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

427. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a recommendation against "recapture" of the Empire District Electric Co.'s Ozark Beach hydroelectric project, located on the White River in Taney County, Mo., pursuant to the provisions of section 14, 16 U.S.C. 807; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

428. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 32d annual report of the Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

429. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of claims paid during the year ending December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, section 2672, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

430. A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of the Boys' Clubs of America, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

431. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report of claims settled by the Agency during the period January 1-December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

432. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a highway safety and beauty trust fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned, long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 23, 1967, the following bill was reported on February 24, 1967:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4515. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted February 27, 1967]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 273. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and separately referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6097. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6098. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 6099. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,500 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6100. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 6101. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 6102. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6103. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6105. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross income for contributions to local, State, and National candidates for public office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6106. A bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6107. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from minimum wage and overtime coverage employees of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6108. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6110. A bill to repeal the prohibition against mint marks on coins of the United

States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6111. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6112. A bill to prohibit political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service, to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6113. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6114. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSSTEIN:

H.R. 6115. A bill to provide for the establishment of a drug stamp program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6116. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6117. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the United States Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6118. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the provisions of certain education acts which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 6119. A bill to create the Inter-oceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6120. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6121. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6123. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6124. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6125. A bill to provide for reimbursement of U.S. cities for a portion of expenses incurred in connection with the entertainment of foreign officials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6126. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare,

and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6128. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 70; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6129. A bill to amend section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the suspension period for the investment credit shall end on June 30, 1967, in the case of railroad rolling stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6130. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 6131. A bill providing for the designation of the gravesite and the ancestral home of Jane Addams in Cedarville, Ill., as national historical landmarks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6132. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 6133. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 6134. A bill to amend section 6 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 6135. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6136. A bill to authorize a program of research, development, and demonstration projects for electrically powered vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6137. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use in commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6138. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 6139. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6140. A bill to authorize appropria-

tions for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 6141. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 6142. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act so as to clarify certain provisions of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6143. A bill to provide a comprehensive program for the control of drunkenness and the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 6144. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 6145. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 6146. A bill relating to the rate of duty on fresh and frozen strawberries which are imported from Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6147. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6148. A bill to require health insurance policies sold in interstate commerce to provide payment for health services performed by dentists and optometrists if the same services, if performed by doctors, are covered under the terms of the policies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6149. A bill to increase the amount of real and personal property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 6150. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6151. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 6152. A bill to establish a program of mutual and self-help housing in the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6153. A bill to establish a National Spelling Commission to reform the spelling of English words, to publish the United States Official Dictionary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 6154. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6155. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend, and reserve provisions;

to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6156. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to permit Federal credit unions to make long-term loans secured by real estate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6157. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6158. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6159. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of disability, based on previous occupational experience, for purposes of disability insurance benefits in the case of individuals who have attained age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to revise and improve the provisions thereof relating to the adjustment of overpayments and underpayments of benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6161. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6162. A bill to provide Federal assistance to courts, correctional systems, and community agencies to increase their capability to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to assist research efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 6163. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6164. A bill to prohibit nepotism in employment under the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 6165. A bill to create a national commission to study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment; to determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices; to recommend to the President and to the Congress methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards, and feasible methods for Federal regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6166. A bill to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a nationwide system of scenic rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 6167. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 6168. A bill to clarify and otherwise

amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 6169. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation payable for service-connected disabilities, and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6171. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide for the payment of additional pension to the widows of veterans who die while suffering from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6172. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6173. A bill to establish the Sandy Hook National Seashore in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6174. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6175. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 6178. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6179. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6180. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 6181. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 6182. A bill to revise the Federal elec-

tion laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 6183. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6184. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6185. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 6186. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to change the name of San Angelo Reservoir project, Texas, to Culbertson Deal Reservoir project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 2, 1967 (and each succeeding first Monday in October) as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 361. Joint resolution concerning designation of National Poetry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal-aid highway program should continue without interruption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the use of the terms salmonella and salmonellosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for the

South Vietnam Constituent Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. Res. 279. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H. Res. 280. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H. Res. 281. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COWGER:

H. Res. 282. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H. Res. 283. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Res. 284. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H. Res. 285. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 286. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and

establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 287. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H. Res. 288. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H. Res. 289. Resolution creating a select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H. Res. 290. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Res. 291. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H. Res. 292. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H. Res. 293. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H. Res. 294. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H. Res. 295. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 296. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotism relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 297. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and

certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H. Res. 298. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 299. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H. Res. 300. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 301. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZION:

H. Res. 302. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Res. 303. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H. Res. 304. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H. Res. 305. Resolution establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H. Res. 306. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H. Res. 307. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships, and for certain other purposes regarding the conduct of a Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H. Res. 308. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, and certain nepotistic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROTH:

H. Res. 309. Resolution to create a Select

Committee on Standards and Conduct and to amend the rules of the House to require disclosure of certain information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Res. 310. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives, establishing requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities, relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists, of Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 311. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of military operations in South Vietnam on the civilian population of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 312. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 313. Resolution providing for additional copies of the report entitled "Food for Progress in Latin America"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H. Res. 314. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 315. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 316. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 317. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 318. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H. Res. 319. Resolution to extend the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

33. By the SPEAKER. A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to citizenship for the membership of the Colville Reservation, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

36. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the conduct of hearings on the subject of percentage distribution of national forest receipts for schools and roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Antonina Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Hi Sook Kwon Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6189. A bill for the relief of Fred W. Kold, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6190. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6191. A bill for the relief of Angela Canepa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6192. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe D'Angelo, his wife, Rose D'Angelo, and Onofrio D'Angelo and his wife, Francesca D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6193. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Taormina, his wife, Vincenza Taormina (nee Bozzetta), and their minor child, Matteo Taormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6194. A bill for the relief of Miss Melody P. de Guzman, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6195. A bill for the relief of Peter Balinas and Lee Balinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6196. A bill for the relief of Caterina Testa Genareo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 6197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gracia Trias Dugal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 6198. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laila Atchoo Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6199. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fair J. Bryant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6200. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Crisanzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6201. A bill for the relief of Rosario Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6202. A bill for the relief of Dr. Takashi Wakamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6203. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Iuliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6204. A bill for the relief of Mari Versenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 6205. A bill for the relief of Marge Eastlyn Savery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 6206. A bill for the relief of Yoshio Okada, Masako Okada, and Keikichi Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6207. A bill for the relief of certain Philippine nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6208. A bill for the relief of Erlinda A.

Camacho, Maria Zoraida Tan, and Arsenia V. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (by request):

H.R. 6209. A bill for the relief of Wesley Crump; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 6210. A bill for the relief of Ethel McLeod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 6211. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 6212. A bill for the relief of Antonio S. Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria da Conceicao Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chung Sook Paik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6215. A bill for the relief of Chang Ghoo-ne Yi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6216. A bill for the relief of Paulina Crisci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 6217. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Moallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6218. A bill for the relief of William E. Neu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6219. A bill for the relief of Alexander Allferis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6220. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Grimbilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6221. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6222. A bill for the relief of Antonia Grimbila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6223. A bill for the relief of Luigi Viekoslav Pirjavec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (by request):

H.R. 6224. A bill for the relief of Mario Cianciulli and his wife, Candida Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6225. A bill for the relief of Errol George Minto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6226. A bill for the relief of Muriel C. Graves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Rebecca Riley Black; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Lloyd T. Eastburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 6229. A bill for the relief of William Wallace Division, Wallace-Murray Corp. (formerly William Wallace Co.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 320. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 6190, for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

37. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to Federal income tax returns, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

Enable Thy servants in this place of governance, in the discharge of great responsibilities of public trust, to be calm, confident, wise, and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast.

Make us honest and honorable enough to bear the vision of the truth, wherever it may lead; to cast aside all pretense; and expediency which warp the soul.

Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood:
And where the sun that shineth is God's
grace for human good.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the light and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:
I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967.

This plan would transfer from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation authority to approve the surrender of certain ship documents. These documents include certificates of ownership, declarations of citizenship, and related ship papers issued for commercial vessels covered by preferred mortgages or owned by the United States.

Under the act establishing the Depart-

ment of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, will have responsibility for recording bills of sale, transfers, and mortgages of ships; for issuing new marine documents; and for retaining custody of preferred mortgages on vessels.

The Secretary of Transportation will not, however, have the authority to approve the surrender of documents for vessels covered by preferred mortgages. That authority still resides with the Secretary of Commerce.

As a result, shipowners will have to deal with two separate departments of the Federal Government every time a ship's name is changed, its structure is modified, or it is sold or transferred.

In each of these and other cases, the shipowner must first seek the approval of the Secretary of Commerce to surrender the ship's documents and then request the Secretary of Transportation to issue new documents.

The reorganization plan is designed to eliminate this duplication of effort, and to save time and expense for shipowners.

This is not a major reorganization plan. But it is important. It is part of our larger effort to streamline the Government, to make its operations as efficient as possible, and to enable it to provide better service to the citizens and businessmen of this country.

This plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title V of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of that title.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1967.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 61)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the District of Columbia. Without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and will be appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our goal for the Nation's Capital is a city of which all Americans can be proud.

As I said 2 years ago, this city and its government must be, for its residents and the entire world, "a living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government." It should be a city of beauty and inspiration, of equal justice and opportunity. It should be a model for every American city, large and small. It should be a city in which our citizens and our friends from abroad can live and work, visit our great national monuments, and enjoy our parks and walk our streets without fear.

The District of Columbia is the Na-